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ABSTRACT

In 1705, the last fascicle of the *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archaeologicus* of George Hickes was published in Oxford. This monumental volume represented a major step forward in Anglo-Saxon studies. This study translates the most monumental chapter of the *Thesaurus*, Chapter 23. Although this chapter “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons,” represents the first sustained attempt to apply a critical and theoretical apparatus to Anglo-Saxon poetry, it is also concerned with attempts to sort out a “purer” language from the various dialects represented in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Hickes directly addresses two major Anglo-Saxon forms in Chapter 23, “pure Saxon,” and “Dano-Saxon,” the lesser of the two languages, because of its “foreignness,” a key term for Hickes, who sought to separate out what he believed to be the true Anglo-Saxon from dialectal languages which he believed to have introduced “abhorrent” elements into Anglo-Saxon poetry.

Ultimately, this desire of Hickes to divine the “purer” language with respect to the Anglo-Saxon reflects a more general eighteenth century anxiety
about the nationalistic uses of language and the attempt to control and modify the language, beginning with Sir William Temple’s essay *On Ancient and Modern Learning*, as well as the response to it by William Wotton in his *Reflections Upon Ancient and Modern Learning*, culminating in Jonathan Swift’s “A Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue,” and Elizabeth Elstob’s *An Apology for the Study of Northern Antiquities*. Especially important was the linking of language to national identity and issues of nation building, as with the establishment of the Académie Française in 1635. This anxiety manifests itself in Swift as an attempt to purge the English language of “barbaric” elements, namely Germanic words and grammatical forms, placing him and his supporters in direct opposition to the antiquarian movement headed by George Hickes and the Oxford Saxonists.
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Chapter One

Introduction

The goal of this dissertation is to provide a translation of a key chapter in the *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus* of George Hickes, a work that was published in fascicles between 1703 and 1705, and to place the text into its eighteenth-century context by examining the reception of the *Thesaurus* along with the scholarly movements and the debates in which it became important. The *Thesaurus* has been analyzed by students of Anglo-Saxon studies and eighteenth-century studies, but it is difficult to find one study that thoroughly contextualizes the *Thesaurus* within its place in the Long Eighteenth Century, and looks at its impact and the response to it during that time period. This translation and analysis will provide valuable information to scholars and remove some of the barriers to understanding and working with key portions of the monumental *Thesaurus*.

The *Thesaurus* is divided into three major parts: the *Dissertatio epistolaris*, a lengthy study of the foundations of Anglo-Saxon and Germanic languages; the *Numismata Anglo-Saxonica et Anglo-Danica*, a treatise by Sir Andrew Fountaine on numismatics appended to the *Dissertatio epistolaris*; and the grammars of Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Norman, Frankish, Icelandic, and Middle English.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) The Icelandic grammar was not written by Hickes but is a reprint of Runólfur Jónsson's Icelandic grammar of 1650. This is the same grammar that Hickes used in his earlier *Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae et Moeso-Gothicae* (1689).
monumental *Librorum veterum septentrionalium ... catalogus historico-criticus* of Humfrey Wanley appeared as a separate, second volume. In this dissertation I will translate and analyze a chapter in the grammar portion of the *Thesaurus*, Chapter 23, and analyze and contextualize its reception and its impact on the Long Eighteenth Century. The translation focuses on poetic composition in Chapter 23. This chapter is crucial for understanding the history of the English language and the perception of this history by eighteenth-century philologists.

Chapter One of this dissertation will cover important background material on George Hickes and his collaborators on the *Thesaurus*. It will also provide a general historical context, including the political and intellectual milieu of the Long Eighteenth Century, which is vitally important to understanding the *Thesaurus* and its reception. Chapter Two will provide an overview of the most important sources for both the Long Eighteenth Century and the roles of Swift and the Oxford Saxonists in this dissertation. Chapter Three will analyze the role Hickes played in an important seventeenth- and eighteenth-century debate, the “Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns,” and contributions to the debate by the Oxford Saxonists and especially Elizabeth Elstob. It will also discuss the role of one of the most famous writers of the period, Jonathan Swift, and how his beliefs on, and fears for, the English language prejudiced his views of the projects of the Saxonists, and Hickes especially. Chapter Four is a translation of the lengthy Chapter 23 of the *Thesaurus*, “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons.”
This translation includes Hickes’s footnotes and his notes on the Anglo-Saxon Menologium. Finally, Chapter Five is an analysis of the translation, and will offer possible explanations and thoughts on why Hickes chose certain models of poetry and how he analyzed what he perceived as “dialects” in the Anglo-Saxon language. I will offer some thoughts on how different Swift and Hickes really were, and why the anxiety that they shared about languages was so important to the formation of a national character and identity for England in the Long Eighteenth Century.

Because the Thesaurus appeared in the midst of an important and heated debate in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries on the nature and uses of language—the English language in particular—it is essential to understand the context of the debate and the major participants in that debate. I will provide an overview of the arguments on language, in England particularly, and I will consider how the Thesaurus entered into that debate. Understanding these debates provides a crucial context for understanding the reception of the Thesaurus and the reception of antiquarian studies in general.

The Career of George Hickes

Hickes’s Childhood and John Hickes
George Hickes was born in 1642 in Newsham, North Yorkshire, the middle son of a Parliamentarian father, William Hickes, and Elizabeth Key or Kay, the daughter of a local rector and herself an ardent Royalist. In one of his treatises entitled *Jovian, or an Answer to Julian the Apostate* (1683), Hickes says of his mother, “It is she who taught him [referring to himself] to preach up Passive Obedience... He sucked it in his Mother’s Milk, it was bred in his Bone, and I fear that it will never go out of his flesh.”

He was educated at the private school at Danby-Whiske under the tutelage of the noted Royalist schoolmaster Thomas Smelt, who

[...] was wont to take all occasions from the Classick Authors to instill in to his upper boys due notions of the sacred Majesty of Kings, & the wickedness of Usurpers [...] In his upper Class which read Homer, he us’d to take occasion from that Author to speak of Kings as God’s Ministers & Vice-regents, & not the People’s, to whom they were not accountable.

It is notable that another pupil of Smelt’s was Thomas Rhymer, the historiographer royal who was executed in 1713 for his part in the Presbyterian Uprising of 1663. Richard L. Harris, in *A Chorus of Grammars*, remarks that, “In such circumstances, he [Hickes] must have grown unusually aware of the

---

2 George Hickes, *Jovian, or an Answer to Julian the Apostate* (London, 1683), 227.
potential uses of the past in contending with the disruptions of traditional order in the present.”

Political involvement seems to have been thoroughly bred into the bones of the two eldest Hickes children. A clergyman himself, although a passionate Dissenter and non-conformist, Hickes’s older brother John (1633-85) first incurred the wrath of the Crown and Church by disobeying the Conventicle Act of 1670 by holding conventicles in his home. Ultimately this led to the death of a magistrate who had been sent to forcibly break up one of these conventicles, and John Hickes was named as the murderer. Eventually pardoned by Charles II through the intervention of his friend Thomas Blood, he ultimately joined the Monmouth rebellion in 1685. He was quickly arrested after the end of the rebellion, and his trial was presided over by “Hanging Judge” George Jeffreys.

Although they were on opposite ends of the political and religious spectrum, George Hickes made a serious attempt to save his brother by intervening with the king for his life. In a letter to his wife John Hickes says, “Monday last my brother went to London to try what could be done for me; what the success will be, I know not.” A later letter by George Hickes regarding the execution and burial of his brother tells the reader a great deal about his character:

I am glad he made such professions of his loyalty, and gave the people such good exhortations to be true and faithfull to their

---

4 Harris, A Chorus of Grammars, 4.
lawfull sovereign, and to detest all manner of rebellion, but am very sorry that he persisted in justifying his nonconformity: this part of his last behavior filleth my heart with greif, tho’ I was prepared to expect it, as knowing very well how ignorant he was of the true nature of church-communion, and how much he was prepossessed with false notions and principles in matters relating to church-discipline and government [...] I also pray you to let me know, whether he left any charge, or message to his children in word or writing, that they should live in the communion of our church and whether he desired, and received the holy sacrament, and if not whether he refused it or it was refused to him, as might justly have been done to a man persisting in schisme.⁶

This and other pieces of Hickes’ correspondence paint the picture of a stern and inflexible man, not willing to compromise or bend his political or religious views for any reason, driven by both his mother’s devotion to the Royalist cause and his shame over the Cromwellian politics of his father.⁷

Yet John Hickes had changed the course of his younger brother’s life. In 1658, George Hickes was sent to live with his brother John in Cornwall, and apprenticed to a Plymouth merchant. John, observing that his younger brother’s talents lay more toward scholarship than toward trade, and with the encouragement of the rector of Plymouth, intervened with his father to end the apprenticeship and send George to Oxford instead. John was successful: George entered St. John’s College in 1659.

Oxford, Thomas Marshall, and John Fell

Right from the outset of his Oxford career, Hickes made his strong religious convictions known; as a new student he scandalized the college by refusing to take sermon notes and attend spiritual exercises, as the college president, Thankful Owens, was a Puritan. He stayed on at Oxford through the Stuart Restoration, moving to Magdalen College, and received his B.A. in February 1663. The next year, he received the Yorkshire fellowship of Lincoln College and took his M.A. in 1665, staying on as a tutor there until 1673.

During his time at Lincoln College, Hickes made the acquaintance of Thomas Marshall (1621-85), a linguist and a collaborator of the Anglo-Saxonist Francis Junius (1591-1677). Marshall had gone to Holland in 1647, where he served as chaplain of the Company of Merchant Adventurers in Rotterdam, and then moved again when the company moved to Dordrecht in 1656. His interest in linguistics stimulated by his time at Oxford, Marshall continued his studies in Holland under the tutelage of Francis Junius and Isaac Vossius, Junius’s highly skilled and talented nephew. Together, Marshall and Junius published a facing-page version of the Gothic and Old English versions of the Gospels in 1665. Kees Dekker has recently established that in fact it was Marshall’s skillful editing of the text that produced the excellent quality of the edition: “[...] even though Junius did the indispensable preparatory work, the 1665 edition is, above all,

---

Marshall’s edition.” Marshall also published the Observationes in evangeliorum versiones perantiquas duas, Gothicas scil. et Anglo-Saxonicas, two volumes of commentary on the Evangelia quattuor. Moreover, Marshall attempted to put together an edition of King Alfred’s Orosius, and he annotated an Old Frisian law text, indicating an interest in the Anglo-Saxon laws. Through this acquaintance with Marshall, Hickes was introduced to one of the most influential antiquarians of his time, John Fell, a canon and the dean of Christ Church and vice-chancellor of the university.

It is nearly impossible to overestimate the influence of Fell on Hickes and his circle of Oxford Saxonists. Fell and Marshall had been the saviors of the university press; Marshall had obtained two boatloads of types, including Junius’s Anglo-Saxon types, and a typefounder from the Netherlands on behalf of Fell for the newly rejuvenated press, now located in the Sheldonian Theater. Fell was also anxious to present new projects to the press, projects which would restore to it its former greatness. One such undertaking that Fell was particularly anxious to see completed was a body of Anglo-Saxon and Gothic grammars and texts. The preface to Hickes’s first major scholarly work, the Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae et Moeso-Gothicae, published by the Oxford University Press in 1689, made mention of Fell’s desire to see more Anglo-Saxon

---

10 Dekker “Marshall, Thomas,” ODNB.
11 Harris, A Chorus of Grammars, 5.
texts come through the press.\textsuperscript{12} He gathered around him a small group of scholars interested in Anglo-Saxon studies, including, on the recommendation of Marshall, George Hickes. Fell first assigned Marshall to produce a grammar of Anglo-Saxon. Marshall never completed the project, and it passed into the hands of the very capable William Nicolson of Queen’s College, who was a brilliant Old English and Old Norse scholar. When Nicolson left Oxford to take up an ecclesiastical post in Cumberland, the task was then assigned to Hickes.

In the early 1670s Hickes had become seriously ill and left Oxford for the Continent, where he met several influential clergy and thinkers, all of whom reinforced his religious and political conservatism. At this time, he began writing the religious pamphlets and sermons that would later earn him fame and criticism. He returned in better health to Oxford in 1674, and took his B.D. in 1675.

\textbf{Scotland and D.D.}

In 1676, Hickes preached a sermon entitled \textit{Peculium Dei}, directed at the misuse of Jewish Law and Scripture by the Dissenters.\textsuperscript{13} This earned him the notice of John Maitland, the second earl and first duke of Lauderdale, who immediately engaged Hickes as his chaplain. Hickes was reluctant at first, because of Lauderdale’s reputation at court for excess and lasciviousness.

\textsuperscript{12} Harris, \textit{A Chorus of Grammars}, 5.

\textsuperscript{13} Harmsen, “Hickes, George” \textit{ODNB}.
Despite his personal deficiencies, Lauderdale was an extremely learned man, and keen on having Hickes with him, not only as chaplain, but as a companion for his studies. Although Hickes found Lauderdale’s courtly life abhorrent, it is easy to imagine that he was strongly attracted to the position for the advantage of being in the company of such a powerful and intellectual man. That Hickes regarded Lauderdale as a match for his own mind is clear: Thomas Hearne records that Hickes learned Hebrew in order to discuss Jewish thought and rabbinical teachings with Lauderdale, who already knew the language.  

Lauderdale was sent to Scotland to serve as Charles II’s secretary of state in an increasingly hostile country, which resented both the abolition of the Covenanter government that had been in control of the country since the early 1650s, and the restitution of the Stuart monarchy and primacy of the Anglican Church over the Presbyterian Covenanter church. Furthermore, the affair of the Marquis of Argyll fifteen years earlier was still strong in Scottish minds: while on a courtesy visit of congratulations to London, Argyll, who had crowned the king in Scotland himself, was arrested by Charles and summarily executed for treason. All of these things combined to make Scotland a particularly restive, and occasionally violent, country. As Lauderdale was Scottish himself, and a former Covenanter, it seemed wise to put him in charge of subduing his recalcitrant countrymen.

---

14 Harris, *A Chorus of Grammars*, 12.
The very real danger that Hickes was placed in is illustrated by the near assassination of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, James Sharp, by Covenant James Mitchell. This assassination attempt was the source for Hickes’s short book *Ravillac redivivus*, published in 1678. For this work, Hickes was given a D.D. from St. Andrews, an honor he was reluctant to accept, probably because he would have preferred to have earned it from his “own” university rather than a Scottish one. He earned his D.D. from Oxford the next year, in December 1679.

Hickes remained chaplain to Lauderdale until 1680, despite having been recalled to England with the duke in 1679, amid the failure to establish the primacy of the Church of England in place of the Presbyterian. After leaving the service of the duke in 1680, Hickes became the vicar of All Hallows Barking, a church close to the Tower of London. This came about largely through the influence of the duke. Lauderdale valued Hickes’s company and was genuinely grieved by the loss of his chaplain, touchingly asking Hickes, “[…] if by the will of God himself should happen to outlive the Duchess, the Dr would give him

---

16 The full title is *Ravillac redivivus, being a narrative of the late tryal of Mr. James Mitchel, a conventicle-preacher, who was executed the 18th of January last, for an attempt which he made on the sacred person of the Archbishop of St. Andrews to which is annexed, an account of the tryal of that most wicked pharisee Major Thomas Weir, who was executed for adultery, incest and bestiality: in which are many observable passages, especially relating to the present affairs of church and state / in a letter from a Scottish to an English gentleman*. Major Thomas Weir was the last man in Scotland executed for witchcraft. He had been a respected man and a pillar of the community, a well-respected Covenant preacher before he spontaneously confessed to witchcraft, copulating with the devil in the form of a dog, and a long-standing sexual relationship with his sister, Jean. Dementia is suspected as the cause of the confession.

17 The Scottish gentleman mentioned in the title of the book was in fact Hickes himself. He had gained a proficiency in Scottish dialects and idiom during his tenure in Scotland. Harris suggests that he cast himself as a Scottish gentleman in the book because he would not have been safe in Scotland should it be known that the author was in fact English.

18 Harris, *A Chorus of Grammars*, 12.
leave to come & live with him, where my Books, sayd he joyn’d with yours will make a very good library & we shall be as happy together as this world can make us.”¹⁹

**All Hallows and James II**

Hickes took up his post at All Hallows, serving at the same time as prebendary of Worcester Cathedral, apparently with the intention of focusing his considerable energy on establishing a reputation as an apologist for conservative Anglican theology.

By this time the Stuart Restoration had become rather tarnished in the eyes of the general populace, and the issue of succession to the throne became paramount in the minds of both the people and the Church of England. Charles’s many affairs, wild parties, and illegitimate children²⁰ might have been overlooked, if he had produced a legitimate heir with his queen, Catherine of Braganza. Unfortunately, Queen Catherine had *not* produced an heir, despite several miscarriages and stillbirths. In what otherwise might have been a commendable show of affection, Charles refused to divorce Catherine when it became apparent that she was not capable of producing an heir. Furthermore, he staunchly defended the queen in Parliament when it brought pressure on him to either beget or name a Protestant heir, increasing fears that his brother James of

---

¹⁹ Qtd. in Harris, *A Chorus of Grammars*, 15.
²⁰ At least twelve acknowledged children and probably several more unacknowledged.
York would become king. James did nothing to allay the suspicions of the people with his very public conversion to Catholicism, and in 1673, his second marriage to the very Catholic princess Mary of Modena.\textsuperscript{21}

It was during this period that Hickes produced most of his most influential and powerful sermons, especially in the wake of the “Popish Plot” and the Rye House Plot\textsuperscript{22} and the following anti-Catholic backlash. By this time, Roman Catholics and non-conformists had already been excluded from office by the Test Act\textsuperscript{23} and from both houses of Parliament. Thus influenced by both his political and religious connections, many of his most important sermons in this period concern the intersection of politics and religion. Hickes’s religious conservatism negatively influenced his view of Charles II’s heir, James, Duke of York. Although Charles was an Anglican in name— but very probably Catholic in sympathy — and actively worked to promote Anglican agendas, James made no great effort to hide his pro-Catholic sympathies, creating a dilemma for Hickes and the country. While Hickes was a conservative in both religion and

\textsuperscript{21} Mary had intended to enter a convent, but instead was persuaded to the marriage with James by Pope Clement X, fueling rumors that she was the Pope’s spy in England.

\textsuperscript{22} The so-called “Popish Plot” was a supposed Catholic plot to assassinate both Charles II and his younger brother James. The plot was utterly fictional, but resulted in the public executions of fifteen supposed conspirators, including five Jesuit priests, in 1681, before it was exposed. The Rye House Plot was a real plot to do the same thing, inspired by the Popish Plot, in 1683.

\textsuperscript{23} The Test Act prevented both Catholics and non-Conformists from holding public offices. Applicants for public offices, or any military posts, were required to take a public oath: “I, [name], do declare that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, or in the elements of the bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.” Charles II, 1678: (Stat. 2.) “An Act for the more effectuall preserving the Kings Person and Government by disableing Papists from sitting in either House of Parlyament.”, Statutes of the Realm: volume 5: 1628-80 (1819), 894-96. URL: http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.asp?compid=47482, accessed 19 September 2010.
politics, he firmly believed in the supreme authority of kingship, and eventually backed James for the throne, a decision which caused him much grief, personal and professional, over the years.

The sermons Hickes preached in this period were largely concerned with his backing of James as Charles’s heir, and aimed at persuading the populace to back James. This cannot have been a comfortable position for Hickes to have been in, given the violent anti-Catholic sentiments of the general public and his own religious views, as well as the fact that his older brother was a non-conformist, linked with the Catholics in many minds. Nonetheless, he soldiered on, preaching and writing, in his support for James. One pointed sermon was entitled *A discourse of the Soveraign Power in a sermon preached at St. Mary le Bow, Nov. 28. 1682. Before the Artillery Company of London*, and was dedicated to the Lord Mayor of London, the alderman and treasurer of the Artillery Company, the Duke of Albermarle, and the Earls of Oxford and Arundel. The text of the sermon is taken from Romans 13:4, “He beareth not the Sword in Vain: for he is the minister of God,” a pointed reminder of which position Hickes was taking up. His explication of the text leaves no doubt:

[...] I shall undertake to prove two propositions. First, That Soveraign Princes are God’s Ministers, and Vice-Gerents, and Reign by his special ordinance and appointment. And Secondly, That as such they have and exercise the Supreme Power, and particularly the Power of the Sword [...] I shall make some practical inferences from this Loyal Doctrin, proper to this Audience and the exigence of the Time in which we live.24

His opinion of James comes through clearly; he uses the Emperors Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus to illustrate his point of abhorrent sovereigns having absolute rule. This sermon was the impetus for Samuel Johnson, a noted non-conformist, to produce Julian the Apostate, a pamphlet attacking James. Hickes’s swift and vehement reply, Jovian, a short book extolling the virtues of passive obedience and the divine right of kings, followed shortly thereafter. By 1683, these sermons and his vigorous activities on behalf of the Crown had earned him the deanery of the cathedral in Worcester; he also retained his parish at All Hallows until 1686.

In 1683 Hickes came into conflict with James many times, first in his intervention for his brother’s life, and finally after the death of William Thomas, Bishop of Worcester, when Hickes publicly refused to summon the chapter to elect a Catholic successor. Matters progressed swiftly downward in 1686, after Hickes preached a sermon on the so-called “Strongbox Papers,” in which Charles II had allegedly confessed his Roman Catholicism. The sermon, entitled An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, prompted a row between James and Hickes, ending with Hickes relinquishing his vicarage at All Hallows, and retiring to the Deanery at Worcester.

The Dean of Worcester and the Institutiones

25 Not Samuel Johnson the lexicographer, but a political pamphleteer and political critic of the same name.
26 Harmsen, “Hickes, George,” ODNB.
As the dean of Worcester, Hickes discovered that he again had time to pursue his antiquarian studies. He had let his work lapse, but once free of his ties to London, he once again took up his studies, and began to work on Anglo-Saxon again in earnest, perfecting his knowledge of the language. He seems to have been happy for a while to put politics and the business of kings behind him, and take up his studies in ancient languages again: Hickes said in a 1688 letter to Arthur Charlett that he was “[…] glad I have this businesse to divert my thoughts from thinking upon our present confusions.”

The cathedral library proved a valuable resource for him as it contained a multitude of Saxon charters, and he worked vigorously to improve the library holdings, with the assistance of an old Oxford friend, now a prebendary at Worcester Cathedral, William Hopkins.

After completing his studies in northern languages, he finally began to tackle the task of compiling a grammar of Anglo-Saxon, which, as previously noted, had been originally given to William Nicolson by Fell, and then abandoned when Nicolson took up a church position in Cumberland.

The delay in writing the grammar turned out to be fortunate. By the time Hickes began work on it in earnest he had access to the previously unavailable Junius manuscripts, which had become part of the collection at the Bodleian Library. In addition, the Anglo-Saxon, Gothic, and Runic type punches and

---

matrices used for the printing of the Junius edition of Genesis A and the Old
English and Gothic Gospels had made their way to the Oxford University Press,
housed in the Sheldonian Theater. This no doubt was enormously helpful in
persuading the press to publish the manuscript, as the cost of having new types,
punches, and matrices was eliminated. These types remained in use until
William Bowyer’s donation to the University of new types and punches used for
the 1715 printing of Elizabeth Elstob’s *Rudiments of Grammar for the English-Saxon
Tongue.*[^29] The help of Arthur Charlett and John Mill, the principal of St. Edmund
Hall, had also proved invaluable to the publication of the grammar under the

It was a slim volume compared to the later *Thesaurus*, but it was a
monumental volume in terms of impact. Adams notes that at least eight
grammars were spawned by the publication of the *Institutiones.*[^30] The publication
marked the first effort towards a complete grammar of the Anglo-Saxon and
Gothic languages, and provided a comparison of them to each other and to other
northern languages, evidenced by the inclusion of Runólfur Jónsson’s Icelandic
grammar of 1650 in complete form. Also included was a valuable, if

[^29]: Harry Carter, *A History of Oxford University Press, Vol. 1: To the Year 1780*

University Press, 1917) 92. The grammars that Adams attributes to this influence are William
Wotton, *Hickesii Thesauri Grammatico-Critici Conspectus Brevis* (1708); Elizabeth Elstob’s *Rudiments of Grammar for the English-Saxon Tongue* (1715); Edward Thwaites’s *Grammatica Anglo-Saxonica ex Hickesiano Thesaurum excerpta* (1711); Shelton’s English translation of Wotton’s *Conspectus* (1735);
Lye’s *Grammatica Anglo-Saxonica* (1743); Manning’s *Grammatica* (1772), which is derived from the
Lye edition; and the *Thesaurus* of Hickes. There is no mention of the eighth grammar.
rudimentary, catalogue of manuscripts, written by Hickes himself, and a
predecessor to Wanley’s later, more comprehensive catalogue.

The Institutiones became the first widely available grammar for students of
Anglo-Saxon; other efforts had not had the circulation that was now possible
with the publication and distribution of the book by such a large and prestigious
body as the Oxford University Press. Eleanor Adams remarks, “The students of
the language had been ninety-three years without a dictionary, one hundred and
thirty-two years without a grammar, and one hundred thirty-nine years without
a general catalogue of existing manuscripts.”\textsuperscript{31} The Institutiones fulfilled two of
those needs, making it hugely valuable to students of the language, incomplete
and abbreviated as it was.

The Revolution and the Non-Jurors

In 1687, with the publication of the controversial sermon, An Apologetical
Vindication of the Church of England, Hickes had added a section from the Capitula
of Theodulf of Orléans, which indicated that the early English church had
functioned without a pope. This inclusion, while small, demonstrates that Hickes
intended to use his studies to further his political agenda. By the time that it was
published in 1689, he had become involved in dangerous politics, which could
well have cost him his life. Passionate as ever, at the last minute in the
Institutiones, Hickes had included the coronation oath of the Anglo-Saxon kings

\textsuperscript{31} Adams, Old English Scholarship, 85.
from Bodleian MS Junius 60, which in turn was Junius’s own copy of BL MS Cotton Vitellius A. vii; the inclusion of the oath gave a further political charge to the book.32 This text, which affirms the divine appointment and right of the king, and emphasizes the divine relationship between the king and God, caused uproar in the House of Commons and more controversy on the impending invasion of William of Orange. The inclusion of the oath was a public declaration of where Hickes stood on the issue of deposing James, and the dedication to the suspended and soon to be deprived Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft, further fueled the fire.33

Certainly the political situation had devolved considerably since Hickes’s retirement to Worcester. James had become increasingly unpopular during the intervening years due to his Catholicism and his increasing reliance on Catholic and dissenting advisors, despite his hatred and deep distrust of dissenters at the beginning of his reign. Furthermore, an indictment of seditious libel brought by James against seven bishops, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, over a declaration of indulgence, which they refused to distribute to their parishes, caused deep dissatisfaction and anger among the clergy and the general public.34 James had also learned that his nephew and son-in-law, William of Orange, was planning to invade England, and by 18 December 1688, James had fled England

32 Harris, A Chorus of Grammars, 25.
33 The dedication was written last, after the deposition of James and the suspension of Sancroft. Sancroft was suspended and ultimately deprived of office in 1690 after refusing to swear the oath of loyalty to William and Mary.
and gone to France. William landed in England in November of 1688, and James arrived in Paris to join his queen and their son on Christmas Day.

This left men like Hickes in a terrible position: having a king in name and a king in fact. The confusion over the issue fueled a major controversy in both houses of Parliament, in which the inclusion of the coronation oath in the *Institutiones* played a significant part. Controversy raged over the divine right of kings, and the so-called “original contract,” a political philosophy which stated that kings have absolute authority over the people, except when the king proves to be a tyrant. Then, the people have the right and the obligation to remove the offending party and establish a new rule. To Hickes, who had been bred to the idea of the absolute right of kings, the notion of deposing a lawful monarch was abhorrent.

When William and Mary were formally crowned in April 1689, Hickes’s problem became more severe. There had earlier been attempts to work out a compromise to restore James to the throne with William acting as regent, but this attempt was thwarted by the presence of James’s heir.35 An attempt to put James Francis Edward, the infant son of James and Mary of Modena, on the throne was made, but an old accusation that the child was not the son of James or Mary had been revived, creating complications. According to the accusations, Mary had instead given birth to a stillborn baby, who was then replaced by a live baby, smuggled into the queen’s bedchamber in a warming pan. Hickes himself

---

became embroiled in this controversy, and as late as 1701, he was trying to prove the legitimacy of the birth by interviewing the midwife, and obtaining a copy of her written, signed testimony, which he forwarded to his friend and former Secretary of the Admiralty, Samuel Pepys.\[36\]

Hickes struggled to find a way to keep his deanery and avoid taking the oath of allegiance to William and Mary, but was unable to compromise between the two. On 1 August 1689, he was formally suspended and deprived of the deanery and his career in the Church of England effectively ended. He might have been allowed to enter retirement quietly and peacefully, like many of his colleagues, if he had simply surrendered to the inevitable. Instead, Hickes decided to resist, and he nailed a claim of right to the door of the cathedral choir. The claim stated that he had been put in office by the rightful king, Charles II, and therefore had a legal right to the title and office of Dean of Worcester, and refused to relinquish it.\[37\]

Predictably, this ignited a firestorm. An arrest warrant was swiftly issued for sedition and high misdemeanor, and there was even talk of amending the warrant to high treason. When an arrest party arrived at the deanery, they discovered that Hickes was not there, although his wife was, and she singlehandedly routed the party, although the couple were obliged to leave at a

\[36\] OSB 7297, Yale University Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, James Marshall and Marie-Louise Osborn Collection, Files 17.372.
\[37\] Harris, A Chorus of Grammars, 33.
later date anyway. With an arrest warrant out for him, Hickes went on the run, a powerful symbol for the non-jurors.

The non-juring clergy continued to refuse to take the oath, and began omitting the customary prayers for William and Mary during services: six bishops and over 400 priests resigned their preferments rather than swear the oath of loyalty. This series of resignations presented another problem for Hickes and the non-jurors: new clergy and, most importantly, new bishops were needed immediately. The big hurdle facing them was a statute left over from the days of Henry VIII, which punished with death the consecration of a bishop without assent from the king. Accordingly, Hickes sought permission from the king in 1693—but that king was not William of Orange. Instead, he went to France and sought permission from James, the man he still considered his lawful king. The next year, William Lloyd consecrated George Hickes and another man as bishops. With a certain death sentence hanging over his head, he was well and truly on the run now.

The Fugitive Years and the Oxford Saxonists

From 1694 to May of 1699, Hickes was a fugitive from the law. He and his wife spent most of the time moving from place to place, living with various supporters and friends, and always looking over their shoulders. In at least one

---

38 Harris, *A Chorus of Grammars*, 34.
40 Harris, *A Chorus of Grammars*, 38. Hickes was consecrated suffragan Bishop of Thetford.
instance, Hickes escaped from the authorities out of a rear door as soldiers entered from the front door, as was recorded after his death by his friend Thomas Hearne:

[… ] the house was once (about twelve a Clock I think) beset on purpose to apprehend him, but he got out at a back door, passed through the Gardens into the Church Yard & escaped safe to Bagshot to Collonel Grymes’s, & his wife followed.\footnote{Qtd in Harmsen, “George Hickes,” ODNB.}

He stayed with a number of Jacobite supporters as well as friends, ending up with a Jacobite antiquary named William Brome in Herefordshire, living with Brome for more than a year.\footnote{Harmsen, “George Hickes,” ODNB.} The toll of the constant anxiety was telling on Hickes; he was frequently in ill health and depressed.

In a predictable fashion, Hickes sought comfort and sanctuary in his books and his studies. Being necessarily deprived of his books by his fugitive status was a real hardship for him, and one that he obviously felt keenly. Hickes had been encouraged to revise and expand the Institutiones, and had immediately begun investigating the possibility after it was published. However, he needed to have access to his books and papers in order to complete the project.

In response to this, he began to assemble a remarkable group of associates; through his friend Arthur Charlett, who was then Master of University College, he selected a group of scholars who had access to manuscripts and books, and were also keen to learn and study the “Northern Languages,” and drew them into collaboration. He had previously had a correspondence and acquaintance
with White Kennett, an antiquarian and vicar of Ambrosden in Oxfordshire; he ended up staying with Kennett early on in his fugitive years. Kennett and Hickes had worked on a project of Kennett’s, an English etymology, which allowed Hickes to also begin to develop his theories on the etymology of Germanic languages. Quickly realizing that what was needed was not a mere revision of the *Institutiones*, but an entirely new work on a much larger scale, Hickes changed the way he approached the book, opting to give the project a new title altogether: *Linguarum veterum septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archæologicus*.

The new project had multiple purposes. First and foremost, the assemblage of scholars, who became known as “the Oxford Saxonists,” was designed to provide Hickes with access to the collections of manuscripts and reference materials that he would need to make the new work successful. His chief assistant, and most valuable helper in gaining access to manuscripts and texts, was Humfrey Wanley (1672-1726), an extremely talented paleographer and scholar, whom Hickes undertook to mentor. Wanley had been born into a middle-class family with little means, and he was apprenticed as a linen draper; however, the lure of the scholar’s life caused him to give up his profession, and as early as 1691, Wanley was learning paleography by transcribing local
Warwick records, and then making a copy of Hickes’s Institutiones for his own use.43

It is believed that William Lloyd, Hickes’s friend and Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, was the patron who allowed Wanley to move to Oxford and there begin a precursor to his great catalogue for Hickes. This project was the Catalogi librarum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae, or Bernard’s Catalogue, which was published in 1697. Wanley’s role, indexing the manuscripts in Anglo-Saxon and Irish, became valuable experience for his work on the Thesaurus. How and when Hickes and Wanley met is unclear, but it is evident that Hickes trusted him enough to give him his confidential mailing addresses, rather than have his letters forwarded, and also trusted him with the revision of the woefully inadequate Catalogus in the Institutiones for inclusion in the Thesaurus.

Wanley was well established at University College, Oxford, and was well on his way to becoming a formidable Anglo-Saxon scholar. In fact, at the time he compiled his catalogue, Wanley’s only equal in the language and knowledge of the manuscripts was Hickes himself, and even Hickes acknowledged in a letter to Wanley that he was the superior: “I have learnt more from you, than ever I did from any other man, and liveing or dying, I will make my acknowledgements more ways than one.”44 When Hickes wrote this remarkable letter he was 55


44Qtd. in Harris, Chorus, 207, n. 45.
years old and already had a reputation as a well-respected scholar in the field; Wanley was 25, and only four years beyond his career as a draper.

Another pair of valuable collaborators was the Elstob siblings, William (1674?-1715) and Elizabeth (1683-1756). William Elstob was a young Oxford-educated clergyman and an Anglo-Saxon scholar, who began his association with the Oxford Saxonists at Queen’s College and quickly became a valued contributor. The first major project that he undertook was an edition of King Alfred’s translation of Orosius’s *Historiarum adversum paganos libri septem*, a project that unfortunately failed due to a lack of subscribers to the planned edition. However, his edition of the *Sermo lupi ad anglos* met with a somewhat better reception when Hickes included it in the *Thesaurus*. Elstob also collaborated with Sir Andrew Fountaine on his Anglo-Saxon numismatics project which formed a valuable part of the *Thesaurus*, and he also translated a version of the Anglo-Saxon Morning and Evening Prayer, which was included in another Hickes project, *Several letters which passed between Dr. George Hickes and a Popish priest*, which appeared in 1705. Although Hickes clearly thought a great deal of Elstob and his scholarship, his career was hampered by lack of funding for his projects, and also by his inability to secure a sufficiently lucrative post. Unfortunately, Elstob would not fulfill his immense promise; in 1715, he died of “consumption,” a tragic end to a potentially fruitful career.

---
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Yet it was William Elstob’s prodigiously talented sister who was perhaps the most important protégée of Hickes. Elizabeth Elstob was an orphan, sent to live with an uncle in Canterbury at an early age with her brother. Although the uncle generously supported William’s education, Elizabeth was not nearly so fortunate. The uncle refused to allow Elizabeth more than a basic education, and for a time would not permit her to pursue her studies on her own. It was only after she went to live with William in London as his housekeeper, after his appointment to as the rector of St. Swithin and St. Mary Bothaw in 1702, that her remarkable talents began to blossom. She became not only William’s housekeeper but his study companion as well. William’s interest in Anglo-Saxon was the door for Elizabeth to learn the language as well; she already knew Latin, Greek, and French before she arrived at Oxford, and she quickly added Anglo-Saxon and was welcomed to the circle of Oxford Saxonists on her own merits. Elizabeth and William collaborated frequently on projects, as well as working individually. Hickes was a staunch supporter of women’s education and later translated a French pamphlet on the merits of substantially educating women and added a large body of his own supporting comments, entitled Instructions for

46 Sarah Apetrei describes an illuminating and interesting correspondence between George Hickes and the feminist and non-juror supporter Mary Astell in a recent article, “‘Call No Man Master Upon Earth’: Mary Astell’s Tory Feminism and an Unknown Correspondence,” Eighteenth-Century Studies 41 (2008): 507-23.
the Education of a Daughter, by the Author of Telemachus (1707). He welcomed Elizabeth gladly and became an enthusiastic supporter of her work.47

Elizabeth’s most important works were her Rudiments of Grammar for the English-Saxon Tongue, and her edition of Ælfric’s homily on St. Gregory, which was entitled, An English-Saxon Homily on the Birthday of St Gregory: Anciently Used in the English-Saxon Church (1709). The edition that she produced was intended as a forerunner to a planned edition of all of Ælfric’s homilies that she hoped to produce. This publication also contains the only conjectured portrait of Elizabeth, contained in a historiated initial at the beginning of the homily text.48

Her Rudiments of Grammar proved to be another of her significant legacies to Anglo-Saxon studies. This was the first grammar of Anglo-Saxon printed in English, intended for use by young ladies who did not have the necessary Latin skills to work with the Institutiones, the Thesaurus, or one of the many redactions of those two texts. Although originally intended for women, the book was used by many others, including Thomas Jefferson during his studies.49

The Rudiments was prefaced by a remarkable text, Elizabeth’s spirited response to Jonathan
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Swift’s derogatory dismissal of antiquarian studies in his open letter to the Earl of Oxford, *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue.* The preface was, and is, an important document in Anglo-Saxon studies as well as in eighteenth-century studies, and one which deserves more attention and study.

Hickes took a three-pronged approach in regards to the *Thesaurus.* First, he intended to fill a gap in Anglo-Saxon studies with not just the grammar portions of the text, but also by offering the first comprehensive look at the development of the English language from its earliest roots through Middle English, which Hickes refers to as “Semi-Saxonic.” The treatment of the relationships between the “dialects” of Anglo-Saxon as well as between other northern European languages is a unique feature of the *Thesaurus,* and even now offers a unique look at the way eighteenth-century scholars studied languages. Chapter 23, “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons,” is a particularly useful analysis—the first sustained rhetorical and comparative study of Anglo-Saxon poetics to ever appear.

The second prong involved the promotion of younger scholars of the language and their accomplishments. The Elstobs, Wanley, Thomas Hearne, William Nicolson, Edward Thwaites, who edited large portions of the *Thesaurus,* and a number of other young scholars of Anglo-Saxon were significantly helped in their scholarly careers by their involvement with the production of the *Thesaurus.* They were offered opportunities to display their talents for a larger
audience and to have a venue for publishing their work. Because of the influence of the *Institutiones*, and the high regard many Saxonists had for Hickes, there was no shortage of volunteers for the project. Timothy Graham remarks of the *Thesaurus*, “[…] it stands as a monument to the spirit of collaboration that existed among the Oxford Saxonists.”

The third aim of the *Thesaurus* was to increase the circulation of Anglo-Saxon texts for the use of scholars who might not have the opportunity to see the original manuscripts themselves, and students of Anglo-Saxon. The breadth of texts reproduced in the *Thesaurus* is remarkable — poetry, literary prose, laws, sermons, a Menologium, charters, and wills. There is a wide variety of texts represented, and some of them, such as an Anglo-Saxon charter, are meticulously reproduced in Humfrey Wanley’s gorgeous Anglo-Saxon script. The range and breadth of the texts, along with Wanley’s *Catalogus*, essentially provides the reader with a detailed primer as well as grammar for the study of Anglo-Saxon. Since the *Thesaurus* was meant to be a major production for the press, and a major aid in the teaching of Anglo-Saxon, the demand for texts for students to translate and analyze would become necessary. Hickes used the *Thesaurus* as a vehicle for disseminating previously unknown Anglo-Saxon works, thereby greatly increasing their availability to students and scholars alike.

---

The Printing and Reception of the *Thesaurus*

Getting the *Thesaurus* printed was an enormous challenge for Hickes and his collaborators. Although the volume had been accepted by Oxford University Press and put into its schedule, there were certain problems associated with an author on the run for his life. Hickes was obviously not physically present in Oxford to oversee the publication and the editing tasks such a huge book must have generated. Edward Thwaites, the *de facto* editor of the book, was the only collaborator to have resided in Oxford the whole eight years of the writing and publication of the *Thesaurus*. The Oxford University Press also delayed the publication; there was only one set of Anglo-Saxon types and matrices at the press, the types Francis Junius had donated, and it was in use from September 1697 to April 1698 while two other manuscripts were being printed, one of them Christopher Rawlinson’s edition of the Old English Boethius.

Hickes was also required to pay for the paper and the printing needed to publish the volume, as the University had earlier lost a significant sum, about £200, on a similar project. The stationer who was to provide the paper was not willing to risk a similar loss without a guarantee of payment, which Hickes was unable to provide. Further, booksellers were “afraid to undertake it,”51 for fear of being stuck with copies of a rather esoteric and large book that they could not sell. The bookseller problem was partially solved by issuing subscriptions for one

---

guinea, which was later raised to five guineas due to the enormous and ever increasing size of Wanley’s catalogue. Many subscribers had paid the full cost up front, while the usual practice was to pay half at the time of the subscription and the other half at delivery; thus, they had to ask many subscribers to pay more money as the collaborators realized that a guinea would be insufficient to pay for printing and paper. Perhaps the caution on the part of booksellers and the press was warranted: the printer Edmund Bush had 200 copies remaining when he died in 1707, and Hickes himself left a further 20 copies to a Mr. Thomas Deacon in his will.

Despite these problems at the press, the *Thesaurus* was warmly received by the subscribers when it was finally finished. There were 353 private subscribers to the *Thesaurus*, listed at the end of volume two, including Dr. John Mill, Richard Bentley, Samuel Pepys, Canon Charles Elstob (the guardian and uncle of William and Elizabeth), the Swedish ambassador, the heads of eight Oxford and seven Cambridge colleges, and the Dukes of Somerset, Ormond, Beaufort, Bolton, and Bedford. The overseas reception was similar; the Duke of Tuscany was particularly impressed, and the College of Antiquaries at Stockholm sent a congratulatory letter to Hickes.52

If it was so well-received by scholars, then why did at least 200 copies remain unsold? The sheer bulk and expense of the *Thesaurus* caused it to miss its primary audience—students. The physical size and weight of the book made it

52 Bennett, “Hickes’s *Thesaurus*,” 43.
difficult for use by students, and the cost priced it well out of the range of most students. Many redactions of the *Thesaurus* appeared immediately after the initial publication, but only Wotton’s redaction, entitled *Hickesii Thesauri Grammatico-Critici Conspectus Brevis* (1708), edited by Hickes and featuring an essay on coins by Edward Thwaites, received any success.

During the completion of the *Thesaurus*, Hickes had largely withdrawn from public politics, although he continued to remain interested on a smaller scale. This seeming retreat allowed Hickes’s friend John, Lord Somers, to obtain a verdict of *nolle prosequi* for him; the charges of treason and sedition were still present, but the *nolle prosequi* ensured that the government would not prosecute for those crimes. With the *nolle prosequi* in place, the *Thesaurus* published, and the accession of Anne to the throne in 1702, Hickes began agitating for the return of the Pretender, James Francis Edward, son of James II and Mary of Modena. This activity plus his concern for the non-juring church, which was in serious trouble due to the defection of several key members and the deaths of others, especially William Lloyd, the deprived bishop of Norwich, in 1710, occupied much of his free time and effort.

In 1710 Hickes was openly living in London with his wife, Frances. Many of the Oxford Saxonists had drifted along to various clerical preferments or other positions. William Nicolson had become bishop of Carlisle in 1702. William Elstob died in 1715, leaving his sister Elizabeth destitute and in danger of being thrown into a debtor’s prison, causing her to leave London, effectively ending
her scholarly career. Wanley, formerly Hickes’s close friend and closest collaborator, was barely on speaking terms with Hickes by 1714, believing that he had not been given the recognition that he deserved for his work and support on the *Thesaurus*, and also that Hickes had not agitated strongly enough on his behalf for a position at the Bodleian Library. Wanley had been working as a librarian for the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and trying in vain to advance his scholarly career, becoming, in 1708, librarian to Robert Harley, the Earl of Oxford. Edward Thwaites had become the Dean of Queen’s College in 1699 and the Regius Professor of Greek in 1707, and was occupied with his duties.

Hickes himself was seriously ill with bladder and kidney stones, and in pain much of the time. He was further grieved by the death of his beloved wife Frances in December of 1714. A letter to Arthur Charlett in December of that year expresses Hickes’s grief at her death:

> My deferring to give you thanks […] was at first caused by the ilnesse, and since by the death of my dearest wife, to whose great, and sole worldly care of me I ow under God my own long life. She had in her sickenesse a most lively sense of the blessed change she was to make, and of the happy place, to which she was going, and dyed fearless of death with the greatest courage, calmnesse, and serenity of Mind […].

Deeply grieving and unhappy, he largely withdrew from his pastoral duties and began to contemplate retirement. Although the letter to Charlett and a few other letters show that he was still interested and taking some small part in further

---

research on Anglo-Saxon philology, it is clear that he was feeble and constantly ill: he apologizes for his trembling handwriting in a letter to Thomas Hearne dated May of 1715. George Hickes died on 15 December 1715. William Bishop wrote to Charlett in early January 1716 that “[…] Those about Him, thought He had not strength to hold out long, but little expected His dying so soon; the day before he dyed, He was as to appearance better & more cheerfull, than for sometime before, God prepare us All for our exit.”

---
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Chapter Two: Literature Review

A large body of criticism has been written about George Hickes and his collaborators on the *Thesaurus*. Much of the background biographical information for this study was collected from the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, specifically Harmsen’s article about Hickes, Gretsch’s article on Elizabeth Elstob, and Peter Heyworth on Humfrey Wanley.\(^{55}\) In addition, more background and biographical material was taken from David C. Douglas’s book *English Scholars 1660-1730*, the second edition (1975). Douglas’s article on Hickes focuses on the period during which he was a fugitive, his most productive period in terms of Anglo-Saxon scholarship.

John Petheram’s book *An Historical Sketch of the Progress and Present State of Anglo-Saxon Literature in England* (1840) surveys the development of Anglo-Saxon studies up to the late 1830s.\(^{56}\) Petheram begins not with the beginning of the history of scholarship in the field, but rather with a statement about the importance of Anglo-Saxon studies, and a brief history of Anglo-Saxon literature and Anglo-Saxon England. Although the book correctly identifies Bale, Parker and Leland as the prime movers in the initial stages of the recovery of the language, and ends with Grimm, Sievers, Kemble, Bosworth, and Conybeare, a

---


large central portion discusses the *Thesaurus* and Hickes’ collaborators. Petheram’s view of Hickes seems to be formed on the basis of the correspondence between Hickes and his collaborators, and amongst themselves. Petheram identifies the *Dissertatio Epistolaris* and the *Catalogus* as the most important parts of the *Thesaurus* on the basis of the plan of study that Hickes carefully laid out and the texts that were available at the time of writing. At this point, Petheram is careful to acknowledge that much of what Hickes had believed to be true about Anglo-Saxon language studies was not true, but that Hickes had laid the way for future scholars to revise and reedit what he had said about the Anglo-Saxon language. He also asserts that the *Catalogus* was originally written in English by Wanley, but translated into Latin under the direction of Edward Thwaites. Given that Wanley had composed a number of letters to Hickes in quite passable Latin, it hardly seems likely that he was unable to write his *Catalogus* in Latin. Petheram ends with a plan for a course of study in Anglo-Saxon, but omits Hickes from the list, reinforcing the idea that at this time Hickes was seen as a pioneer, but largely irrelevant to “modern” scholarship on the subject.

Eleanor M. Adams’s book *Old English Scholarship in England: From 1566-1800* (1917) is a more detailed and analytical survey than Petheram’s. Adams’s book, her PhD dissertation at Yale, is careful to document the progress of Anglo-
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Saxon philology from Bale and Leland, much as Petheram did. The majority of her focus is on the eighteenth-century scholars, and especially on Hickes and the Oxford Saxonists. She glosses over the scholars after Lye and Manning, doing a particularly brief gloss over Rask, Sievers, Thorkelin, and Grimm, less than three pages about all the German and Scandinavian philologists. However, the discussion of the Long Eighteenth Century explores Hickes and his collaborators thoroughly, intricately detailing their professional and personal relationships, sometimes correctly, sometimes not.

Adams is the first scholar to point out Hickes’s role in the debate between the Ancients and the Moderns, although she believes him to have had a much larger role in the issue than he probably really did have. Her examination also functions as a kind of “apologetics” for Old English scholarship, explaining in detail why the Oxford Saxonists chose the methods they did for the examination and presentation of poetry and prose. She quotes a 1694 letter from Hickes to Charlett at length, in which Hickes expresses his interests in the connection between the northern languages, and how they might relate to French and Latin; the fruits of this interest appear in the latter part of chapter 23, “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons.” This knowledge of dialects and variations of the language helped Hickes sort through charters and legal documents and figure out which were Norman forgeries and which were genuine Anglo-Saxon documents. She also asserts that Thwaites translated the Catalogus into Latin for Wanley, probably taking a cue from Petheram’s study.
Adams’s interest in how the group functioned as collaborators and the dynamics of such an unusual group is a strong point of her book and essential to understanding how and why the *Thesaurus* has the form that it does, and how the collaboration worked. She focuses intently on Wanley and the Elstobs, although, like many others including Petheram, she mistakenly believes the Elstobs to have been related to Hickes. She also offers several appendices of value, including a printing history of the Saxon types and the names and work of several societies dedicated to studying Anglo-Saxon that appeared before 1800.

The role of Anglo-Saxon studies and the Saxonists in the debate over the Moderns and Ancients was recognized early by Rosamund Tuve in her article “Ancients, Moderns, and Saxons” (1939). Tuve recognizes the connection between the language debates and a development of the uniquely English national rhetoric and polemic, which fed the idea of an English national identity. The idea that Anglo-Saxon studies derives from a desire to “[…] furnish England with an historical and cultural background second to none” is a major theme in her article. Much of the article is spent on the earlier years of Anglo-Saxon studies: Parker, Bale, Leland, and L'Isle. She connects the Saxonists and the efforts towards recovering Old English with the Moderns’ side. Her reasoning is simple: although the effort to recover Anglo-Saxon and Old English should have been a solidly Ancient task, the methods that the Saxonists used, such as textual

criticism, the “appeal to MS authority,” and variant readings, put them firmly in the Moderns camp. Tuve identifies Matthew Parker as the originator of these methods although she disapproves of his motives, namely as a prop to the legitimacy of the Anglican Church. The motive for the later study of Old English is to prevent the encroachment of “foppish” affectations in the language and to provide the English language with a firm foundation of good, solid, “plain,” stylistics which Tuve characterizes as “manly honesty,” over foreign “polish and rhetoric.”

She also recognizes and significantly details Elizabeth Elstob’s Apology as an important force in the debate, pointing out that the very characteristics that Elstob chooses to emphasize as being the “best” qualities of the language are exactly the same as those that characterize the Moderns, with their preference for simple and plain style over ornate and flowery style favored by the Ancients. Although Hickes is mentioned, Tuve generally glosses over the Thesaurus, preferring to focus on Elstob and her Apology as the terminus in the debate.


The article provides a detailed study of exactly what needed to happen in order to get the *Thesaurus* published and a general history of the Oxford University Press itself. Bennett describes and discusses how, despite all the difficulties that the collaborators faced, Hickes managed to keep them enthusiastic and working on a project that seemed doomed to failure, and how their collaboration changed the face of Anglo-Saxon studies altogether.

The details of the printing are fascinating. By January 1700/01, 140 sheets had been printed, of which Bennett remarks, “[...] this was satisfactory progress considering that the Oxford University Press had no great reputation for speed.” In these details he gives an excellent account of Edward Thwaites, a competent and industrious scholar and the key figure in the printing of the book. Bennett points out that Thwaites is often overshadowed by Wanley and Hickes, but had it not been for the steady cajoling and management of the team along with his constant urging of the press, there is no way that the *Thesaurus* would have ever seen the light of day. The article also clears up the problematic issue of Thwaites’ input into the *Catalogus*; instead of having translated it into Latin, Bennett says that Thwaites translated the preface only, and cites Thomas Hearne as a source for the comment.60

---

The other item which makes Bennett’s article so valuable is his minute tracking of the financial side of the printing, including how much contributors were paid (Wanley was paid £60, a pittance for all his work), how much the printers were paid, and the overwhelming debt that Hickes incurred by the printing of the *Thesaurus*—over £500. Bennett ends with the comment that although in 1948 a copy of the book would cost at least as much as it did when it was first printed, it was still a valuable investment to make given the scope of the work.

A 1950 article entitled “The Neo-Classical View of Old English Poetry,” by Samuel Kliger, addresses the tendency of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scholars to characterize Anglo-Saxon poetry, and the Cædmonian verses in particular as Pindaric in nature, something which several other authors noticed as well.61 Kliger asserts that it is no coincidence that the appreciation for the first published texts of *Cædmon’s Hymn* and the other Cædmonian poems occurred at the same time as the Pindaric revival. Neo-Classical literary theorists deliberately drew comparisons between the “educated” poet and the “natural” poet, classing “Cædmon’s” poems of the natural and thus more authentic poet, with the Pindaric odes. Stephanus Iohannis Stephanius classed what he called “bardic” poetry, really Anglo-Saxon poetry, as “inspired” and “fervent,” and he hinted at a connection for the first time between the Anglo-Saxon poems and the Pindaric

---

odes. By his reasoning, the “bardic” poets were, in his limited perception, largely occupied with composing victory songs, thus there was an obvious connection between the Pindaric victory songs and the bardic odes of the Anglo-Saxon poets. The explicit connection between the two was Sir William Temple in his discussion of the “Song of Ragnar,” where he identifies runic, also known as “scaldic” verse as a kind of Pindaric. This is, of course, echoed in Hickes’s own linking of Cædmon with Pindar in “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons.”

The 1955 article “George Hickes and the Thesaurus,” by William Gardiner, is a brief overview of the beginnings of the Thesaurus project, and the common misconception that the Thesaurus was begun at the urging of Hickes’s friend and protector, White Kennett.62 White Kennett was a clergyman in Ambrosden who sheltered Hickes after he was forced to flee Worcester, and was an antiquarian himself; during his stay, Hickes had helped Kennett finish a project of his, but the friendship between Kennett and Hickes soured after Hickes had published the Thesaurus, and the two continued to trade barbs in print as well as in private letters. Kennett’s animosity partially stemmed from his opposition to the non-jurors, and he frequently accused Hickes of being too much involved with politics. Hickes’s biographer, Hilkiah Bedford, in his unpublished biography of Hickes, stated that he had conceived of the project long before he took shelter with Kennett, and Gardiner traces the earliest beginnings of the project to

---

September 1696, too early for Kennett to have urged Hickes to start the *Thesaurus*.

In terms of scholarship on eighteenth-century linguistic scholars, no volumes have proven more valuable in examining the state of the debates and particularly Jonathan Swift’s role in them than Irvin Ehrenpreis’s monumental three-volume biography of Swift, entitled *Swift: The Man, His Works, and the Age* (1962-83). Ehrenpreis does not largely concern himself with Swift’s connections to the antiquarian movement except to suggest that Swift’s antipathy towards Hickes might stem not just from his dislike of Hickes’s theories on language, but also from a deep distrust of Hickes’s politics. Ehrenpreis discusses Swift’s deeply Tory politics and the pinning of his hopes on Robert Harley and Lord Bolingbroke to admit him to the inner circles of power amongst Tories. From there, Swift believed he could be launched into literary fame, although the chances were slim due to his angering Queen Anne with *A Tale of a Tub*. The whole three volumes of the biography provide essential background on Swift’s contemporaries and the political and social issues that Swift was dealing with when he wrote *Tale of a Tub* and his *Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue*, both of which deal directly with the antiquarians, especially the Saxonists.

---

Michael Murphy discusses Elizabeth and William Elstob in his 1966 article, “The Elstobs, Scholars of Old English and Anglican Apologists.” Murphy discusses how Elizabeth Elstob’s *Apology*, although Anglican in spirit and intent, was able to admit that the early English church was part of the Roman church, a fact that some Church of England scholars had denied in their desperation to separate themselves as fully as possible from the Roman Catholic. In her preface, dedicated to Queen Anne, Elizabeth makes the point that although the church was part of the Roman church, the language of the “orthodox faith” which Anne presides over, and the language of the laws which Anne now enforces, was originally Old English. The ultimate point is, of course, that the Anglican Church is the “purer” church, remaining faithful to the past, while the Roman church has become corrupt. Murphy does mention that she touches briefly on the use of Old English in the Anglo-Saxon church, but focuses more closely on the idea of St. Augustine of Canterbury as part of the apostolic succession straight from St. Gregory and backward to St. Paul.

Murphy’s discussion of William Elstob’s work and the connection to the Anglican church focuses mainly on William’s “A Publick Office of Daily and Nightly Devotions for the Seven Canonical Hours of Prayer, used in the Anglo-Saxon Church,” which was appended to Hickes’s *Second Collection of Controversial Letters* (1715) and to Hickes’s earlier *Several Letters Which Passed between Dr. Hickes*.

---

and a Popish Priest (1705). William intended the prayers to serve as proof of “[…] how pure their devotion was from error and superstition in those times […]”65 Murphy also admits that compared to his sister and Hickes, William was not a particularly vehement defender of religious polemic, and remains in the shadow of the other two scholars because of this disinclination to assume the role of an apologist.

Elizabeth Elstob and her brother were again studied in Sarah H. Collins’s unpublished 1970 dissertation, “Elizabeth Elstob: A Biography.”66 Collins begins by saying that any work that studies Elizabeth must by necessity examine William as well; the work and the lives of the two during their most productive period are so intertwined and so closely related, that one must study both of them for at least the time span 1703 through 1715, when Elizabeth lived with William in London. Collins’s overarching intent is to locate Elizabeth within the larger context of the eighteenth century and as not only a pioneer of Anglo-Saxon studies but also a leader of the grammatical tradition that was beginning to emerge during the eighteenth century. Elstob mentions the grammarian John Brightland in the preface to her grammar. Furthermore, Elstob’s book serves as not only a grammar of Anglo-Saxon for women; it also serves as a grammar for English, for an underclass that was not necessarily well-educated in basic English grammar, thus supporting another goal of Elstob’s, helping increase the access to

65 Murphy, “The Elstobs,” 137.
education for all classes. Collins suggests that this may be why, after fleeing London, Elizabeth first kept a day-school and subsequently became the governess to the Duchess of Portland’s children, a job she took very seriously and worked hard at. She also describes Elizabeth’s “rediscovery” by the antiquarian and dress-maker George Ballard.

Collins also carefully details the intricacies of Elizabeth and William’s publications, examining their sources and fitting them not only into the history of scholarship but also positioning them securely as orthodox Anglicans promoting a sound Anglican doctrine, as Murphy had done earlier. William was far less inclined to engage in polemic than his sister was, but he still worked on the sidelines of the debates, engaging himself quietly in a supporting role. Ultimately Elizabeth is portrayed as a scholar who was ill-suited to the time in which she was placed, and almost criminally neglected by later scholars.

The article “George Hickes, White Kennett and the Inception of the Thesaurus Linguarum Septentrionalium,” by Richard L. Harris (1981), chiefly discusses Hickes’s development as a scholar of Anglo-Saxon and a theorist, and how the Thesaurus changed from being simply a revision of the Institutiones into a fully worked and developed volume of its own. Harris also discusses the role of White Kennett. As noted above, Kennett has sometimes been listed as a prime mover in the revision of the Thesaurus, as having given the idea for the revision

---

to Hickes. Gardiner’s 1955 article proves that, in fact, Kennett did not give Hickes the idea for the revision, but here, Harris enumerates what his role actually was. Like Hickes, Kennett saw his own research into antiquarian subjects as a doorway to a fuller contemporary political and religious understanding. Kennett’s *Etymologicon Anglicanum*, a compilation of dialectical forms in English, which Hickes helped him with during his stay, helped develop Hickes’s theoretical approach to the *Thesaurus*.

In her 1983 article “Swift’s Satire against Modern Etymologists in ‘The Antiquity of the English Tongue,’” Ann Cline Kelly addresses a little known satire called “Discourse to Prove the Antiquity of the English Tongue,” a short, posthumously published satire in which Swift assumes the persona of the “Modern Etymologist,” who communicates largely through puns. Although the article does not directly address the antiquarian effort, it provides valuable insight into Swift’s ideas about language and cultural stability and social contexts. Kelly points out that puns are the ultimate in stable language since the entire joke focuses on one accepted definition of a word, a traditional linguistic definition. Swift’s “Modern Etymologist” destabilizes that whole idea by throwing into question general coherence. Intentional punsters are demonstrating a control over the language, while unintentional punsters are showing an ignorance and “lack of understanding of communal values.” He

---

further makes the “Moderns” – who, in his opinion, create their own meanings of words, thus destabilizing the language by undermining those communal values – look ridiculous and largely irrelevant to civilized discourse. Of course, thanks to their methods of study and their published scholarship, Swift classed the Saxonists and most antiquarians as Moderns, condemning them along with the etymologists and linguistic scholars.

David Fairer’s article “Anglo-Saxon Studies,” in volume 5 of *The History of the University of Oxford*, traces the development of the program in Old English at Oxford, and the role of the university in promoting it. Since University College was supposedly founded by King Alfred, the university had good reason to promote and be proud of Anglo-Saxon studies. Fairer traces the development of the program from the seventeenth century and how and why the study declined. Anglo-Saxon studies had an auspicious beginning at University College. The head of the college, Obadiah Walker, translated Spelman’s life of Alfred into Latin and appended several of Alfred’s other works to the project, and as a University College man, William Elstob vowed to translate as much of Alfred as he could. The article traces the careers of the Oxford Saxonists, including Hickes, Thwaites, Nicolson, the Elstobs, and Humfrey Wanley. Fairer also addresses the appointment of Thwaites to the post of Anglo-Saxon preceptor at Queen’s College in 1698, and his gathering of a class of students in Anglo-Saxon. These

first classes highlighted a serious lack of grammars and dictionaries for the students, which left Thwaites scrambling on behalf of his students to provide instructional materials. The *Thesaurus* was in part created to help fill this void, and Fairer discusses Hickes’s role as the senior statesman and mentor to the program and its teachers and students. Despite the availability of the *Thesaurus*, aforementioned problems led it to be an impractical textbook. Wotton’s *Conspectus brevis*, a redaction of the *Thesaurus* and dismissed by a jealous Hearne as “[…] a Trivial, mean, Performance […]” was the choice of textbook for students at Oxford instead. The program began to falter significantly after the deaths of Thwaites in 1711 and Hickes in 1715, and students already resident at the university began to leave in favor of clerical posts and other employments. Although William Nicolson endowed a lectureship in Anglo-Saxon which was split between Oxford and Cambridge, the appointee to the post at Oxford was not particularly interested in Anglo-Saxon and certainly nowhere near as skilled as Thwaites and Hickes had been. Thus the program gradually faded away, with the exception of Edward Lye.

More scholarship on Hickes and the *Thesaurus* is also described in *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography*, by Joseph M. Levine (1987). Levine does the invaluable work of showing how Hickes and his collaborators were forced by circumstance into accepting a classical model for

---

their studies, which proved to be an incorrect model. This particularly affected the study of Anglo-Saxon languages and the developing theories of poetics, which were analyzed through a classical viewpoint, and forced into a classical Latin grammatical model which was inappropriate for a Germanic language. Still, even here the focus is on Hickes’s career as a non-juror and his tenuous place in the prevailing classically inclined modes of language analysis.

More significantly, Levine wrote *The Battle of the Books: History and Literature in the Augustan Age* (1991), a very rich treatment of the debate between the Ancients and the Moderns, and the involvement of Swift and his circle with the antiquarians. Levine’s purpose is to put the Quarrel between the Ancients and Moderns in a larger historical context, as merely another volley in a battle that had been going on for years. He not only discusses the Temple versus Wotton exchange, but also Richard Bentley’s various concurrent quarrels and the reception of Alexander Pope’s *Iliad*, which was poor due to Pope’s weak Greek, and the writing of *The Dunciad*. Levine focuses intensely on the irascible Bentley and on the dissipated Wotton, but skillfully connects the threads between all the major players and texts in the Quarrel. He traces the developments of the debate and the many concurrent threads that were swirling about. This is by far the best book for understanding the context that the *Thesaurus* was launched into and for

---

understanding the roots of the debate with a strong focus on the eighteenth century beliefs and thoughts that gave it such a difficult reception.

Ann Cline Kelly has more intensely studied Swift’s extraordinarily passionate beliefs about language and its uses and abuses.73 Swift and the English Language (1988) provides a little material about the antiquarians’ connection to Swift, but, more importantly, it offers valuable insight as to why Swift took the efforts of the Oxford Saxonists as seriously as he did. Swift had passionate feelings about the state of language, and wished to “fix” it securely to a stable cultural and nationalistic context. As demonstrated in the episode of the Houyhnhnms in the last book of Gulliver’s Travels, a language without a social context is worse than nothing: it is dangerous to the perceptions of humans. The Tale of a Tub frequently uses the word “annihilate” to describe what happens to the coat of the three brothers, a metaphor for the “social fabric” that holds nations together. Kelly devotes a chapter to the Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue (1712), a letter dedicated to Robert Harley, the Earl of Oxford, and ironically, Humfrey Wanley’s employer. This is the only text that Swift published under his own name, which is probably due to the intense importance that he attached to the subject. She correctly points out that although the Proposal should be straightforward enough Swift engages in his customary obfuscation and contrariness so that it becomes a typically Swiftian document.

He insults the Whigs, probably in the hopes that they will disassociate themselves from the project of the Academy that he is proposing, despite the fact that he declares that the Academy should be non-partisan. He also displays uneasiness with the idea of an Academy as he always was suspicious of institutions designed to provide solutions; the major satire in the third book of *Gulliver's Travels* focuses around the Academy in Lagado, whose members create nonsense with their “word machine.” These internal inconsistencies undermine the whole argument of the *Proposal*, making it less effective as a rhetorical document.

Recent research has focused on Elizabeth Elstob as a feminist scholar in her own right. The most important of these studies is Mechthild Gretsch’s monumental two-part article, “Elizabeth Elstob: A Scholar’s Fight for Anglo-Saxon Studies.” The first part of the article provides a brief overview of the roots of Anglo-Saxon studies, beginning with Lambarde and Parker, and then moves quickly to Spelman and Wheelock. Gretsch moves into a detailed biography of Elstob; she makes mention of Elstob’s first “real” translation from the Anglo-Saxon, the translation of the “Athanasian Creed,” which appeared in Wotton’s *Conspectus Brevis*. The second part of the article deals with Elstob’s scholarly achievements and more particularly her methods of work and her editing methods. She details Elstob’s use of manuscripts, describing the

---

manuscripts that Elstob used and remarking on her seeming ease of access to collections, her methods of annotation, treatment of textual variants, and her transcriptions. Gretsch points out, very rightly, that the tone Elstob used in her notes on Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies* is not “[…] the voice of a woman instructing an audience of fashionable ladies; hers is rather the voice of a scholar participating in a scholarly discourse and the pursuit of learning.”75 Ultimately, this is what Elstob herself would have wanted for her work. This article on Elstob is a refreshing treatment, focusing as it does on her work and far less on Elstob as a feminist icon.

We are particularly fortunate to have a large volume of correspondence, not just of Hickes, but also of some of his closest collaborators on the *Thesaurus*. The most comprehensive and sustained examination of the *Thesaurus* and the collaborative efforts of the Oxford Saxonists, and the most valuable to this study, is found in Richard Harris’s *A Chorus Of Grammars: The Correspondence of George Hickes and His Collaborators on the “Thesaurus Linguarum Septentrionalium,”* published in 1992.76 This book is an edition of the correspondence of Hickes and many of his collaborators, including Wanley, Edward Thwaites, Arthur Charlett, and Edmund Gibson. Harris provides a detailed background to Hickes’s life and career both as a churchman and as a scholar in *A Chorus of Grammars*, as well as in a short biographical article published in volume 2 of *Medieval Scholarship:*

However, it is the letters that are the most valuable to this study, and they provide a wealth of information. The letters provide insight into the evolution of the thoughts and the ideas that shaped the final form of the *Thesaurus*.

In 2000 two important articles appeared in one volume: *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. The foremost of these articles is “The Construction of Structure in the Earliest Editions of Old English Poetry,” by Danielle Cunniff Plumer. Plumer discusses the reasoning behind how Old English poetry was structured in the earliest publications. The first of these was the 1574 publication by Matthew Parker, the *Ælfredi regis res gestæ*, which includes the Metrical Preface to Alfred’s translation of Pope Gregory’s *Regula pastoralis*. Hickes’s first comments on poetry were made in the *Institutiones*, where he comments on the Chronicle poems, which he describes as being “Cædmonian,” despite Wheelock’s description of them as “rough.”

Thwaites makes a note on 28 July 1698 that Hickes had shown him two chapters from the *Thesaurus*; one was the chapter on dialectal forms, the other a chapter “[…] concerning the poetry of the old Saxon […]” unquestionably chapter 23, “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons.” Plumer then addresses how Thwaites

---


probably conveyed Hickes’s poetic theories to Christopher Rawlinson, who used them in his *Meters of Boethius*, which was one of the manuscripts at the Oxford press that held up the publication of the *Thesaurus*. Rawlinson used Hickes’s ideas to dictate the visual formatting of the *Meters*. Furthermore, Hickes himself tried to use his own metrical theory in the lineation of the poetry, but sometimes could not make it work without the textual metrical markers. The editing of *The Battle of Brunanburh*, for example, without metric markers but using Hickes’s theories, results in one line, “beorna beah-gyfa. 7 his broðor,” becoming several syllables too long, thus exposing the weaknesses inherent in the system that Hickes had proposed.

The second article, Angelika Lutz’s “The Study of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the Seventeenth Century and the Establishment of Old English Studies in the Universities,” is a general outline of Anglo-Saxon studies in the seventeenth century, progressing from the foundation of the Society of Antiquaries in about 1586 through the establishment of a formal course of study of Old English in English universities. Lutz traces the study of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* through the seventeenth century, focusing on the editing of the Chronicle poems, and discussing how each successive generation of Saxonists treated them. In the period of the Oxford Saxonists, the focus is, of course, on Edmund Gibson, who re-edited the poems using a different manuscript than the

---

previous version by Abraham Wheelock. Having had the benefit of Hickes’ *Institutiones*, Gibson was able to provide a much more satisfactory version of the *Chronicle*, and he was correctly able to identify the *Chronicle* poems thanks to Junius and Somner. Finally the article describes the ultimate dispositions of the manuscripts of the *Chronicle* in the seventeenth century. Although there was great confusion among many Saxonists over the chronology and the numbering of the manuscripts, Wanley’s *Catalogus* in 1705 cleared up much of the confusion and he was able to correctly identify and separate out the various versions.

More recent scholars such as Seth Lerer have attempted to place Hickes back into his historical framework in an attempt to show how the *Thesaurus* was influenced by its context. Lerer, in his article “The Anglo-Saxon Pindar: Old English Scholarship and Augustan Criticism in George Hickes’ *Thesaurus*,” tries “[...] to relocate Hickes along the axis of an English literary history that emerges in the Augustan age and, in the process, to illustrate how his conception of that history is both aesthetically and politically determined.”

Lerer posits Hickes as a critic of not only Old English poetry, but also contemporary poetry, so that he becomes one of the first literary theorists. The contemporary poetry that Hickes quotes in the *Thesaurus* is almost universally focused around the themes of loss, sorrow, and grief, not surprising for a man in his circumstances. Furthermore, the history of England and English that emerges in the criticism is driven by both

aesthetic and political considerations. As Collins placed Elstob into a larger historical context and a larger movement, Lerer places Hickes into the same; while Collins placed Elstob into a more overarching grammatical tradition, Lerer is contextualizing Hickes as a leading-edge literary theorist, whose work was applied to Augustan poetry.

These articles provide a valuable breadth of knowledge, but most do not provide much depth into the *Thesaurus* itself and how Hickes and his contemporaries treated Anglo-Saxon poetry. Many books and articles are interested in the relationships between the collaborators in the extensive circle of the Oxford Saxonists, which are important in understanding how the *Thesaurus* was assembled and published, but are sadly shallow in their insights into the theories that Hickes was developing. Lerer’s study is on the right track with his work on Chapter 23 and his placement of Hickes in a theoretical context, but does not go quite far enough. I believe that this translation and edition of Chapter 23 will help place Hickes not only as an Augustan theorist, but as the father of Anglo-Saxon poetic theory. Understanding Hickes’s work will provide useful insights into the editing of Old English poetry in the early stages, and also how we critically analyze poetry the way we do now. Furthermore, a translation will open up new avenues for scholars who may not have the requisite language skills to work with the *Thesaurus* in the original Latin.
Chapter Three: The Great Language Debates and the Antiquarian Enterprise

On the face of it, it is a great irony that one of the most basic and fundamental human gestures, language and speech, can produce such anxiety in a nation with such force. Yet it is precisely because of the basic nature of language and communication that it does have such power over people. Languages define us as a people, and help us to identify members of our own “groups,” however we choose to define them, and help us to identify the “others,” those who are not members of our “group.”

This anxiety is clearly communicated in King Alfred’s Preface to his translation of Gregory’s Pastoral Care. It is no coincidence that what Alfred is most deeply concerned about is the decay of English reading and writing among the clergy, leading to a breakdown in communication. It is also notable that Alfred recommends that all clergy be trained to communicate in English first, and then a few talented ones be taught Latin, and that learning English is clearly thought to be the pathway to greater wisdom. Furthermore, in Alfred’s eyes, it is the connection to their ancestors that is most important to them:

Ure ieldran, ða ðe ðas stowa ær heoldon, hie lufodon wisdom, ond ðurh ðone hie begeaton welan on us læfdon. Her mon mæg giet gesion hiora swæð, ac we him ne cunnon æfter spyrikegan. Ond for ðæm we habbād nu ægðer forlæten ge ðone welan ge ðone wisdom, for ðæm ðe we noldon to ðæm spore mid ure mode onlutan.81

Our forefathers, who before held these places, they loved wisdom, and through it acquired wealth they left to us. Here men may yet

---

see their footsteps, but we cannot follow after them. And therefore we have all together forfeited both the wealth and the knowledge, because we would not follow that course with our minds.  

The idea that losing one’s sense of the language leads to losing a sense of identity and engagement with the culture as a whole is pervasive. It is small wonder, then, that upon seizing the English crown, William of Normandy almost immediately changed the *lingua franca* of the court to French and the law to Latin rather than permitting them to remain in English. This change of language allowed William to rebuild English society on a distinctly French model, dictated by Norman custom rather than native English tradition.

Although the language of the court and diplomacy remained French for several hundred years, the English language was adapting and assimilating the Romance language lesson it was receiving. However, by the fifteenth century, a whole new generation of men and women were being raised up, people who considered themselves culturally and politically English, as opposed to the court of the early Normans and the Plantagenets, who considered themselves culturally and politically French. The printer William Caxton, in his preface to *The Recuyell of the Histories of Troy*, comments, “[a]nd for so much as this book was new and late made and drawn into French, and never had seen it in our English tongue, I thought in myself that it might be had as well in the royaume of England as in other lands […]” and thus concluded in myself to begin this said

---

82 My translation.
work.” The point is, Caxton and other writers and printers at this stage could no longer be certain that their readers, a literate class of nobles and the middle class, could even read French any longer, something that earlier would not have even been an issue.

This anxiety has most recently manifested itself in the “English-only” movements which have sprung up in a surprising number of states in the U.S. In general terms, the “English-only” advocates argue that permitting bilingual education and bilingual public services, such as driver’s tests and other forms of public media, consumes a large proportion of money and time which could be spent more profitably elsewhere. The more extreme supporters of the movement have even referred to bilingual educators as “ethnic militants” and “Hispanic separatists.” The website “ProEnglish” asks its readers to “[u]rge Congress to defend English,” characterizing itself and summarizing its position on the homepage as “[…] the nation's leading advocate of official English. We work through the courts and in the court of public opinion to defend English's historic role as America’s common, unifying language, and to persuade lawmakers to adopt English as the official language at all levels of government.” The passing of Proposition 227 in California in 1998, which eliminates bilingual

---


Spanish/English education in public schools,\(^{85}\) was a huge victory for English-only advocates. The law even allowed educators and public school administrators to be sued for personal liability and damages for failing to heed the law.

By the time that the whole of George Hickes’s *Thesaurus* was published in 1705, there had been for many years an intense interest in the “improvement” and development of the English language. Almost the whole of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries witnessed a restless development in ideas of national identity and exploration, reflected in the intense interest in both language and identity. “Pirate narratives,” written by buccaneers and outright pirates alike, were immensely popular, and entered the public imagination. The most widely known of these narratives was the adventures of the buccaneer William Dampier, acknowledged by Swift’s Gulliver as “Cousin Dampier.” His journals in particular provided much new information about native cultures of South America and the Caribbean.\(^{86}\) Much of what drove this exploration was a desire for a new definition of national identity.

Anglo-Saxon had more or less ceased to be a living language by the twelfth century. Elaine Treharne estimates that English stopped being a significant written language during the period c. 1060-c. 1200; although a fair number of manuscripts were written in Anglo-Saxon during that time period,

---

\(^{85}\) See [http://primary98.sos.ca.gov/VoterGuide/Propositions/227.htm](http://primary98.sos.ca.gov/VoterGuide/Propositions/227.htm) for the full text of the law and for arguments for and against the law.

increasingly Latin was becoming the primary written language. Certainly by the High Middle Ages, Anglo-Saxon was a dead language.

During the English Renaissance interest in antiquarian studies had been revived in a significant way. Although there were scholars and antiquaries interested in the recovery of Anglo-Saxon toward the middle of the sixteenth century, specifically Robert Talbot and John Leland, it was not until the 1560’s and the work of Archbishop Matthew Parker and his associates that Anglo-Saxon was subjected to concentrated study. The efforts of the Parker circle focused primarily on chronicles and religious texts in an attempt to provide precedent for many of the political and religious decisions that accompanied the reign of the Tudors. Parker himself was a driving force in Anglo-Saxon scholarship, providing multiple texts for printing and amassing a collection of manuscripts which would become valuable to future scholars.

Anglo-Saxon poetry had not yet been recognized as poetry because of the written format of the texts: straight linear format like prose, with no separations into individual poetic lines or verses, although in some poems there were metrical markers. Laurence Nowell did some annotating of Anglo-Saxon poetry, as established by his ownership of the codex in which Beowulf appears and some glossing of the Exeter Book poems.

---

Anglo-Saxon scholarship continued after the death of Parker in 1575 despite the dissolution of the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries in the early seventeenth century by James I. Especially notable was the amassing of the extremely important collection of manuscripts by Sir Robert Cotton. The trend towards working with political and religious texts of the previous century continued with some slight decline in the number of students of the language and a reduction in the number of printed editions of Anglo-Saxon texts. In 1659, William Somner published his *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, providing students of Anglo-Saxon with the first printed dictionary of the language.

There was, however, little work on poetry or poetic texts in general after Nowell until the Dutch scholar Francis Junius began his work in England. When Junius began to recognize Anglo-Saxon poetry on the basis of metrical structure, it was a major turning point for the study of Anglo-Saxon poetics; the notion that there was no Anglo-Saxon poetry was dispelled, and serious investigation of poetry and poetic theory commenced. Junius’s edition of the “Cædmonian” *Genesis*, published in 1655, was the first published poetry that attempted to mark out metrics and line structure, based on metrical points in his source manuscript, Bodleian Library MS Junius 11.90

The next sixty years brought about a “Golden Age” in Anglo-Saxon studies, with William Nicolson, George Hickes, Humfrey Wanley, and the Elstobs, among others, beginning to generate and publish Old English

scholarship. In 1689, Hickes produced the *Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxoniae et Moeso-Gothicae*, a grammar of Anglo-Saxon, Icelandic, and Gothic, which he revised and incorporated into the *Thesaurus*. In the *Institutiones*, Hickes himself provided the grammar of Anglo-Saxon and Gothic, along with a brief and spotty catalogue of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. There was no attempt to deal with poetry or poetic theory in the *Institutiones*, a lack for which Hickes would make up in the *Thesaurus*.

The development of, and interest in, the native English grammatical tradition influenced the mixed reception of the *Thesaurus* by scholars. On the one hand, philologists and scholars received the *Thesaurus* favorably, as evidenced by the letters from Continental scholars that Hickes received after its publication. Still, despite the warm reception that the *Thesaurus* received from foreign scholars and men of letters, the book was only partially successful in its goal of being a textbook for students of the language: the volume was simply too expensive for most students to afford, despite the multiple choices in bindings available for buyers, and ultimately 200 copies remained unsold upon the death of Hickes’s printer, Edmund Bush.

By the eighteenth century, the issue of language as a point of national identity and unity had interested scholars across Europe and America. As Susan Reynolds remarks, “Words shed or accumulate meanings as the world they
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represent changes and as people’s ideas change [...] We must study the words of
the past in such a way as to discover the concepts of the past [...]”⁹³ Especially
important was the linking of language to nation building, as with the
establishment of the Académie Française in 1635, but it took a small pamphlet
written by a rather undistinguished nobleman to bring the matter to a head in
England.

If Sir William Temple is remembered at all today it is most likely for his
lively correspondence with his wife Dorothy Osborne. Born in 1628, Temple was
the son of Sir John Temple, a lawyer and the Master of the Rolls in Ireland, and
his wife Mary. William Temple was a study in contrasts; he attended Emmanuel
College, Cambridge, but left with only the dubious honor of having become a
reasonably good tennis player and with no degree. He was a competent
diplomat, serving as a special ambassador to Christopher-Bernard von Galen, the
bishop of Münster who was England’s closest ally during the Second Anglo-
Dutch War, and then as ambassador to the Netherlands. He was equally capable
of taking rash actions and making ill-informed decisions which led to diplomatic
errors. Temple kept a personal chaplain at his beloved retirement home, Moor
Park, and attended services every day; yet he encouraged inquiry and skepticism
about religion, at one point being strongly suspected of being an atheist. At the
core, Temple was basically an indolent man, fond of pleasure and luxury, and

⁹³ Susan Reynolds, “What Do We Mean by ‘Anglo-Saxon’ and ‘Anglo-Saxons’?” The Journal of
determined to spend his later years indulging in both. Although Temple was not a scholar and did not fancy himself an intellectual, he still enjoyed literature and scholarly debate, and was himself a writer of romances, poetry, and essays. His essays show an intellectually lively man with a sense of humor and wit, but relatively shallow insight. He was also a voracious reader who kept au courant with the latest writers and philosophers, including Montaigne, Burnet and Fontenelle, and it was his encounter with reading Fontenelle that re-introduced England to a longstanding debate.

Sieur Pierre Fontenelle had written a book entitled *Digression sur les anciens et les modernes*, which was published in 1688. The argument as Fontenelle sketched it out was between the “ancients,” thinkers and writers who stoutly maintained that the intellectual tradition represented by such thinkers and writers as Virgil, Aristotle, Cicero, and Homer could not be overtaken, and that they were the proper models for imitation, and the “moderns,” such as Fontenelle himself, who believed that modern scholarship far surpassed anything that the ancients were able to produce. In response to Fontenelle, Temple wrote a reply entitled *On Ancient and Modern Learning* (1690), and then followed up with *On Poetry* (1690).

The central argument in *On Ancient and Modern Learning* is simple: that “Thales, Pythagoras, Democritus, Hippocrates, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus were the first mighty Conquerors of Ignorance in our World, and made greater progresses in the several Empires of Science than any of their Successors have been since able
to reach." Temple begins the argument in an odd way, rejecting the common metaphor of "[…] Dwarfs standing upon a Gyant’s shoulders, and seeing more or farther than he," by concluding "[…] that Nature being still the same, these must be much at a Rate in all Ages, at least in the same Clymates, as the Growth and Size of Plants and Animals commonly are […]" Furthermore, tradition, and in particular oral tradition, is accorded a place of great supremacy:

Books may be helps to Learning and Knowledge, and make it more common and diffused; but I doubt whether they are necessary ones or no, or much advance any other Science beyond the particular Records of Actions or Registers of time; and these, perhaps, might be as long preserved without them, by the care and exactness of Tradition in the long Successes of certain Races of men with whom they were intrusted […] how much better the Records of time may be kept by Tradition in one country than Writing in another, and how much we owe to those Learned Languages of Greek and Latin, without which, for ought I know, the World in all these Western parts would hardly be known to have been above five or six Hundred Years old, nor any certainty remain of what passed in it before that time.

Since Temple was primarily an admirer of literary theory and philosophy, science and natural philosophy received short shrift from him. Astronomy, in his eyes, may have advanced with Copernicus, but even Copernicus’s discoveries may well have drawn from the “Ancient Fountains.” Furthermore, in the field of medicine, Temple introduces Harvey’s discovery of the circulation of the blood as a possible Modern advance, and then immediately undermines it by
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saying, “But whether either of these be modern discoveries, or derived from old Fountains is disputed: Nay, it is so too, whether they are true or no; for though reason may seem to favor them more than the contrary Opinion, yet sense can very hardly allow them; and to satisfie Mankind, both these must occur.” 98

The doubt whether or not these ideas “derived from old Fountains,” was in part due to the horrors of the Middle Ages, thought Temple. According to him, “Upon the Fall of the Roman Empire, almost all Learning was buried in its Ruines: The Northern Nations that Conquered, or rather overwhelmed it by their Numbers, were too barbarous to preserve the Remains of Learning or Civility more carefully than they did those of Statuary or Architecture, which fell before their Brutish Rage.” 99 Compare that with the Persians and Scythians, who in Temple’s view invaded and then carried away and preserved the learning of Rome and Greece, making use of it in enriching their own cultures. The Goths and Visigoths were themselves conquered by the Roman Church, but their devotion to the Roman Catholic Church “[...] gave great Authority and Revenues and thereby Ease to the Clergy, both Secular and Regular, through all their Conquests [...] But these good men either contented themselves with their Devotion or with the Ease of quiet Lives, or else employed their Thoughts and Studies to raise and maintain the Esteem and Authority of that Sacred Order to which they owed the Safety and Repose, the Wealth and the Honour they
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enjoyed.” Neither were the laity of any use in Temple’s eyes, preferring feats of arms, wars, and displays of chivalry and honor to genuine learning of any sort, eerily echoing Alfred’s earlier complaint: “Learning [was] so little in use among them that few could write or read, besides those of the Long Robes.” Universities, although present, were of small use, serving only as a path of clerical advancement to Rome instead of preserving and furthering any intellectual study or growth. Only the fall of Constantinople with its exodus of Greek scholars and learned classics proved to be the salvation of the Western world.

When the subject turns to languages, Temple waxes most eloquent:

Do any of the moderns we Converse with appear of such a Spirit and Force as if they would live longer than the Ancient have done? If our Wit and Eloquence, our knowledge or Inventions would deserve it, yet our languages would not; there is no hope of them lasting long, nor anything in them; they change every Hundred Years so as to be hardly known for the same, or any thing of the former Styles to be endured by the later; so as they can no more last like the Ancients, than excellent carvings in Wood like those in Marble or Brass.

The beauties of French, Spanish, and Italian are only remarkable in that to have remained so noble, these languages must have derived from a particularly noble and beautiful language, which they did—Latin: “’Tis easy to imagine how imperfect Copies these modern Languages, thus composed, must needs be of so excellent an Original, being pacht up out of the Conceptions as well as sounds of
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such barbarous or enslaved people. Whereas the Latin was framed or cultivated by the thoughts and uses of the Noblest Nation that appears upon any Record of Story, and enriched only by the Spoys of Greece, which alone could pretend to contest it with them.”¹⁰³ He ends the essay with a quotation from Alfonso the Wise, King of Aragon, “That by so many things are Men possessed or pursued in the Course of their Lives, all the rest are Baubles, Besides Old Wood to Burn, Old Wine to Drink, Old Friends to Converse with, and Old Books to Read.”¹⁰⁴

The essay was initially launched fairly quietly into England, and might even have gone completely unnoticed, except for two men who then joined the debate, and ignited a controversy. The first was a theologian and scholar, living in Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire. William Wotton (1666-1727) had been a child prodigy, learning Greek, Latin, and Hebrew at five, entering St. Catherine’s College, Oxford at nine as a pensioner, and matriculating with a B.A. three years later, having learned Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldee, as well as the more mundane French, German, and Spanish.¹⁰⁵ Orphaned at eleven, he became a special ward of Gilbert Burnet, later Bishop of Salisbury, and was through his patron’s connections employed by William Lloyd, then bishop of St. Asaph, as a librarian; this may be how he first came into contact with George Hickes, with whom he developed a friendship. He joined the Royal Society and was a Fellow by the age of 21. Where Temple was admittedly a dilettante in languages, Wotton was a
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serious scholar and brilliant linguist. If Temple had a shallow knowledge of the complexities of poetry and the history of the English language, Wotton had a far deeper acquaintance with them. Temple was concerned with style and taste, Wotton with substance. After reading the Essay by Temple, Wotton prepared a carefully reasoned discourse, examining each side with appropriate gravity and depth, bringing out a dense volume entitled Reflections on Ancient and Modern Learning (1694).

Poor Temple was hopelessly outmatched from the start. Wotton began his essay by declaring himself to be a neutral party in the debate, believing “[...] if the several boundaries of Ancient and Modern Learning were once impartially stated, Men would know better what were still unfinished, and what were, in a manner, perfect; and consequently, what deserved the greatest application, upon the Score of its being imperfect [...].”

106 The proponents of the Ancients, in his view, were automatically crippled by a language barrier; the best texts of the Ancients have to be read in Latin or Greek, and “To read Greek and Latin with ease is a thing not soon learnt [...].” Although translations in modern languages exist, modern languages are crippled by the lack of nuance which exists in the classic authors in their own languages, so any translation is automatically an inferior copy. He pointed out that Temple had confused two very important issues in the debate: who were the greatest men and who were
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the most learned? As Wotton observed, one is not necessarily automatically the other. The chief conclusion that Wotton came to was that the ancients had indeed achieved superiority in moral and political philosophy, but that it was possible to *equal* their achievements given the correct set of conditions, and “[…] the Moderns could share their insights, and the superiority of the ancients lay in their experience, not in any special genius.”

Like Temple, he admitted the Ancients to be superior in poetry, rhetoric, philosophy, and moral philosophy; yet believed that the Moderns could well rival and equal the Ancients, very much *against* Temple. Furthermore, in terms of the sciences, a field which the artistically-inclined Temple virtually ignored, Wotton believed that the Moderns had far outstripped the Ancients; being a member of the Royal Society and friends with the leading lights of science such as Newton, Boyle, and Hooke could have hardly disposed him to think anything else. The ultimate verdict from Wotton was,

> Though Philological and Critical Learning has been generally accused of Pedantry, because it has sometimes been pursued by Men who seemed to value themselves upon an Abundance of Quotations of Greek and Latin, and a vain Ostentation of disused Reading, without any Thing else in their Writings to Recommend them; yet the Difficulty that there is, to do anything considerable in it, joyned with the great Advantages which thereby have accrued to the Commonwealth of Learning, have made this no mean Head whereon to commend the great Sagacity, as well as Industry of these later Ages.\(^{109}\)

---


Wotton makes a strike at perceived indifference to religion despite observance of the forms, in an attempt to reconcile the subject with his own religious beliefs:

But I had another, and a more powerful reason, to move me to consider this Subject; and that was that I did believe that it might be some way subservient to Religion itself. Among all the Hypotheses of those who would destroy our most holy Faith, none is so plausible as that of the *Eternity of the World*. The fabulous Histories of the *Egyptians*, *Chaldeans* and the *Chinese* seem to countenance that Assertion. The seeming Easiness of solving all difficulties that occur, by pretending that sweeping Floods, or general and successive Invasions of Barbarous Enemies, may have, by Turns, destroyed all the Records of the World, till within the last Five or Six Thousand Years, makes it very amiable to those whose interest it is, that the *Christian Religion* should be but an empty Form of Words, and yet cannot swallow the *Epicurean* Whimsies of Chance and Accident.\(^{110}\)

This is clearly aimed at Temple, who was rumored to be an agnostic at best, atheist at worst, yet kept a chaplain and attended services at Moor Park.

Ironically, it was Temple’s chaplain who led the defense against Wotton: Jonathan Swift.

Since Temple’s position and wealth allowed him the luxury of a private chaplain, he selected the best that was available to him. The youngest child and only son of an Anglo-Irish family of minor nobility, Swift was educated at Trinity College, Dublin and was pursuing his M.A. when the political situation in Ireland became volatile due to the Glorious Revolution. His mother, a cousin of the poet John Dryden and Sir Erasmus Dryden, arranged for Jonathan to come to
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England and meet Temple. He went to live at Temple’s retreat at Moor Park in 1689. There, he not only served as chaplain but also became the tutor to Esther Johnson, the eight-year-old fatherless daughter of the cook at Moor Park, in whom Temple had a special interest. Esther Johnson later achieved immortality through Swift’s pen as his beloved “Stella.”

When Wotton’s book was published, Temple’s friends took immediate umbrage at his perceived criticisms and refutations of their friend. Many of them hotly replied to Wotton, although Temple himself refused several times to print a rebuttal to Wotton. The most savage of these replies came from Swift, who shared both Temple’s love of the classical authors and complete antipathy towards the modern sciences, in the form of two separate satires, A Tale of a Tub and The Battel of the Books, which were written together in 1697, and published in 1705. A Tale of a Tub is Swift’s first major work,\footnote{Although Swift’s cousin, Thomas Swift, claimed authorship of the Tale, the claim is almost certainly false, and Jonathan Swift himself rebutted it. The reasons why Thomas Swift claimed it as his work are unknown, but may have been to spare his cousin the eventual problems that resulted from the publication of the text.} certainly his most complex and multi-layered text, and consists of an extremely complex tangle of satires on various subjects. Although very difficult to explicate due to the multiple layers of the text, a classic feature of Swift’s satires and essays, it is one of his most brilliant. Joseph M. Levine comments on A Tale of a Tub and its contents: “No one, it is safe to say, had ever seen anything quite like A Tale of a Tub [...] Satire and invective there had been aplenty throughout the quarrel, but here they were raised to new heights by a curious kind of imaginative power so far unequaled in
English literature.”¹¹² This was also the piece that scotched any hopes Swift had for social and clerical advancement once his name was attached to it, as Queen Anne herself believed it to be profane and irreverent.

The main text of the Tale has a bearing on the debate about the Ancients and the Moderns. The tale is a religious satire centered on three brothers, Peter, Martin, and Jack, representing the Roman Catholic Church, Martin Luther, and John Calvin and their inheritance of a coat, which represents religious doctrine. The main satires appear in a series of “digressions” scattered throughout the main text. Each digression is a self-contained essay on a single topic, covering ground from critics to madness, and the digressions serve as reminders to the readers of the nature of the satire. Yet Swift comments in his “Apology” that he wrote it “[...] but to expose the Abuses and Corruptions in Learning and Religion.”¹¹³ This is very probably one of the rare times in the work where Swift emerges from behind his created persona of a “hack writer,” known to Swift scholars as the “Grub Street Hack,” to express clearly what he intends these short works to do.¹¹⁴

Every digression returns to the theme of the debate and Wotton. In his fifth edition (1710), Swift goes so far as to incorporate Wotton’s criticisms of the text as footnotes as though they were placed there by Wotton himself. The first

¹¹⁴ It is generally a good idea when reading Swift to automatically assume that he means exactly the opposite of what he says.
digression “Concerning Critics” is a brilliant lampoon, unequaled by any of the other digressions. Swift takes Wotton’s arguments and turns them around on him, detailing the pedigree of the Moderns from Momus and Hybris, Momus being the child of Night in Hesiod’s *Theogony*, and transformed into the symbol of mean-spirited criticism by Plato in the *Republic*, but finally ending the pedigree with Wotton and Richard Bentley.

Ultimately, Swift is communicating a deep fear about what will happen to the language if it is allowed to go through the same paths of religion; additions, embellishments, and eliminating the solid foundations at the base. He draws out the parallels between religion and language, and the structure of the digressions and the structure of the pieces of the main tale are clearly meant to reflect one another. As Peter in the first portion of the tale embellishes and changes the coat he inherits from his father, the first digression is a warning against “improving” language so far that the original language cannot be recovered. Ann Cline Kelly remarks, “By this extended analogy, Swift implies that altering the common forms with self-inspired embellishment will weaken and ultimately destroy them. The unifying fabric will be rent, and only a heap of odd decorations will remain. Once traditional English the ‘Mother-Tongue’ is displaced as standard, individual dialects will proliferate until no common tongue prevails.”

---

This anxiety about the language being changed culminates in the only piece that Swift actually wrote and published under his own name, *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving, and Ascertaining the English Tongue* (1712). This is also the source of his most direct attacks on the antiquarian efforts, although he does not actually name names. This is also the piece that Elizabeth Elstob correctly interprets as an attack aimed at her mentor Hickes, spiritedly responding to Swift in the preface to her Anglo-Saxon grammar, *An Apology for the Study of Northern Antiquities*.

The *Proposal* is dedicated to Robert Harley, the Earl of Oxford, and the patron of Humfrey Wanley. As is common with Swift, the piece is confusing and contradictory, despite its seeming directness. The *Proposal* does contain a number of very serious issues, first and foremost of which is the proposal for the establishment of a national “Society” to reform and correct the English language, following the precedent set forth by the French and the Italians. Swift’s plan for the academy is logical, and given his passion for language, I think it not at all unreasonable to assume he was very serious about this plan. Completely in character for Swift, he is recommending the establishment of a governing body of the kind of which he himself was openly distrustful. The Academy is a modern establishment, which naturally makes an avowed Ancient partisan uncomfortable. Furthermore, he suggests “[...] that a free judicious Choice should be made of such Persons, as are generally allowed to be best qualified for
such a Work, without any regard to Quality, Party, or Profession.”

Yet, although he would not have admitted it, such a body already existed: the Royal Society, which admitted people regardless of religion or social status. This desire for an academy to direct the development of language manifested itself as one of the first projects that the Royal Society sponsored, a project to create a more specific and precise scientific language.

However, in typical form, Swift can’t resist taking a few swipes at his “enemies,” including the antiquarians and contemporary poets. Of the poets he says,

There is another Sett of Men who have contributed very much to the spoiling of the English Tongue; I mean the Poets, from the Time of the Restoration. These Gentlemen, although they could not be insensible how much our Language was already overstocked with Monosyllables; yet, to save Time and Pains, introduced that barbarous Custom of abbreviating Words, to fit them to the Measure of their Verses; and this they have frequently done, so very injudiciously, as to form such harsh unharmonious Sounds, that none but a Northern Ear could endure [...],

a statement that closely echoes Hickes’s sentiments about contemporary poets. But Swift isn’t content to merely snipe at the poets; he goes after the antiquarians too:

The rude Latin of the Monks is still very intelligible; whereas, had their Records been delivered down only in the vulgar Tongue, so
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barren and so barbarous, so subject to continual succeeding
Changes, they could not now be understood, unless by Antiquaries
who made it their Study to expound them. And we must at this
Day have been content with such poor Abstracts of our English
Story, as laborious Men of low Genius would think fit to give us
[…]\(^\text{118}\)

And again:

Your Lordship will be of my Opinion, that we ought to struggle
with these natural Disadvantages as much as we can, and be
careful whom we employ, whenever we design to correct them,
which is a Work that has hitherto been assumed by the least
qualified Hands. So that if the Choice had been left to me, I would
rather have trusted the Refinement of our Language, as far as it
relates to Sound, to the Judgment of the Women, than of illiterate
Court-Fops, half-witted Poets, and University-Boys.\(^\text{119}\)

His metaphor describing what he sees as the major problem—“[…we struggle
with an ill Climate to improve the nobler kinds of Fruit, are at the Expence of
Walls, to receive and reverberate the faint Rays of the Sun, and fence against the
Northern Blasts […]”\(^\text{120}\)—could not be any more pointed.

When Swift suggests “fixing” the language, he uses the word, not in the
sense of “correcting,” but as in “pinning or holding.” Once the language had
been corrected by the Academy he proposes, the Academy would then be
responsible for maintaining the language in the “correct” forms in print. Swift
exempts the spoken language as too fluid to be fixed so precisely, but regulation
of printed discourse was to be tightly controlled to exclude anything that was not
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“correct.” His admission, “it is better that a Language should not be wholly perfect, than it should be perpetually changing,”\textsuperscript{121} is a definite clue to his views.

Why was Swift so insistent on this rigid control of language? What did he think would happen if the language was left on its own? The much later \textit{Gulliver's Travels} (1726-27) contains a number of instances where language breaks down: the word machine in the Academy of Lagado, and when Gulliver makes his final voyage to the Houyhnhnms, the “intelligent” horse people, whose language he masters, and the repugnantly human, but largely non-verbal Yahoos. By the end of the story, Gulliver is clearly insane, preferring to spend his time at home in the stables, conversing with his horses, and referring to his family as Yahoos. Once the controls of language break down, chaos reigns, beginning with the nonsensical predictions of the word machine, and ending with the overthrow of human reason.

Although Swift takes the breakdown to its most absurd extremes, there is a sense of reality underlying the situation: when a man loses his language, he has lost his most basic identity as a human being. If a nation loses its language, it has lost its basic identity. Chaos becomes the rule of the day when men cannot understand one another, and barbarism becomes the price that a nation pays. Swift, anxious for the state of his country and its identity among the nations of Europe, naturally sees the breakdown of language as the ultimate national
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disaster. This anxiety in turn was directed at those he saw as threatening the language from within, namely, the Oxford Saxonists.

Swift’s Proposal provoked the ire not of Hickes himself, but his protégée, Elizabeth Elstob. Elstob had greater reason than most to feel warmly and well about Hickes; as a woman, she had come perilously close to having her linguistic talents totally suppressed by her uncle, who had contemptuously declared that “one language was more than enough for a woman.”\textsuperscript{122} Only her removal to her brother William’s home and the resulting friendship with Hickes saved her from complete oblivion. Hickes had already been a staunch partisan of a solid education for women, and he must have recognized something special in Elizabeth Elstob. In 1712, Hickes proudly wrote to Arthur Charlett,

\begin{quote}
I suppose you have seen Mrs. Elstob and the MSS she brought to be printed in your presse. The publication of the MSS she hath brought (the most correct I ever saw or read) will be of great advantage to the Church of England against the Papists […] and the credit of our country, to which Mrs. Elstob will be counted abroad, as great an ornament in her way as Madame Dacier\textsuperscript{123} is to France.\textsuperscript{124}
\end{quote}

Elstob had already been lampooned in The Tatler, a literary and society journal established by Richard Steele, its main contributors being Steele, Joseph Addison, and Jonathan Swift. In the issue dated Thursday, September 1 through

\textsuperscript{123} Anne Le Fevre Dacier, a French translator of the classics, including Sappho, Terence, Plautus, and Aristophanes. She also translated an important prose version of The Iliad.
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Saturday, September 3, 1709, a letter from “Tobias Greenhat,” a pseudonym of either Steele or Swift, but most probably Steele, discussed the establishment of an academy for young women,

[...] where, instead of scissors, needles, and samplers; pens, compasses, quadrants, books, manuscripts, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, are to take up their whole time [...] Another of the professors is to be a certain lady, who is now publishing two of the choicest Saxon novels, which are said to be in as great repute with the ladies of Queen Emma’s court, as the ‘Memoirs of new Atalantis’\textsuperscript{125} are with those of ours.

Elstob more than repaid the confidence of her mentor in her skills, and her defense of Hickes and the circle of Anglo-Saxonists, including her brother, was spirited. Her *Apology for the Study of Northern Antiquities* was prefixed to her grammar of Anglo-Saxon, the first Anglo-Saxon grammar in English, and written expressly for the use of women and young ladies studying the language. She rightly corrects Swift on his perception of the origins of the English language, and perceptively notes that his ignorance of the language preempts him from being able to make any pronunciations on the correction of English:

This hath often occasion’d my Admiration, that those Persons, who talk so much of the Honour of our Countrey, of the correcting, improving and ascertaining, our Language, shou’d dress it up in a Character so very strange and ridiculous; or to think of improving it to any degree of Honour or Advantage, by divesting it of the Ornaments of Antiquity, or separating it from the Saxon Root, whose Branches were so copious and numerous. But it is very remarkable how

\textsuperscript{125} Written by Mrs. Manley, a friend of Swift and a collaborator on several of his political pamphlets. She believed Steele responsible for this letter.
Ignorance will make Men bold, and presume to declare that unnecessary, which they will not be at the pains to render useful.  

She follows that up with a passage from 1 Timothy, 1:7: “Desiring to be Teachers of the Law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.”

Elstob hits squarely at Swift here, and makes apparent the defects that prevent him from being able to comment authoritatively on any aspect of the language, and then derisively states, “But they have not had Learning or Industry enough to fit them for such Acquaintance, and are forc’d therefore to take up their Refuge with those Triflers, whose only Pretence to Wit, is to despise their Betters.”

Where Swift complains vigorously about the “rude” monosyllabic character of modern poetry, Elstob, with a delightfully acid sweetness, points out that Chaucer, Dryden, Pope, and even Virgil employed monosyllables, and then excuses her judgement in poetry, by pointing out that it sounds well to her “Northern Ear” which she sweetly admits might be defective.

Ultimately, Elstob with a slight bitterness says, “Methinks it is very hard, that those who labour and take so much pains to furnish others with Materials, either for Writing, or for Discourse, who have not Leisure, or Skill, or Industry enough to serve themselves, shou’d be allowed no other Instances of Gratitude, than the reproachful Title of Men of low Genius, of which low Genuis’s it may be observed, that they carry some Ballast, and some valuable Loading in them,

---

which may be despised, but is seldom to be exceeded in any thing truly valuable, by light and fluttering Wits.”

Prominent writers and politicians such as Daniel Defoe, John Dryden, John Evelyn, and the Earl of Roscommon made public their desire to see the establishment of an academy such as Swift had suggested for the “preservation” and improvement of the English language. This desire for an academy to direct the development of language manifested itself as one of the first projects that the Royal Society sponsored, a project to create a more specific and precise scientific language. This desire did not fade away slowly; indeed, it spread even further. Allen Walker Read documents attempts to establish a language academy in the later part of the century. Most notable is the effort of Robert Baker in 1770, who, in an address to the King, proposed,

[...] that your Majesty would at some leisure Hour take it into Consideration whether or not it might be proper to establish in London, an Academy of the Nature of that of the Belles Lettres at Paris, and of several in Italy. This seems to be a Thing extremely wanted among us. Our Language, as has often been observed, is manly and expressive: but our Writers abound with Incorrectnesses and Barbarisms: for which such an Establishment might in great Measure be a Cure.

There was also some attempt in early America to establish an academy, largely driven by the desire to see a distinctly American style in writing and speech, as opposed to English, again an attempt to connect the establishment of a

\[129\] Elstob, An Apology, 25.
\[130\] Kelly, Swift and the English Language, 8.
national identity with a distinctly different use of language and speech. There were several aborted attempts to establish such a foundation, none of which met with much success. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences established in Boston in 1780 was consciously founded on the French model, even so far as to avoid the use of the word “society,” preferring the French term, “academy.” Likewise, John Adams championed a foundation before Congress, saying, “The honor of forming the first public institution for refining, correcting, improving, and ascertaining the English language, I hope is reserved for congress; they have every motive that can possibly influence a public assembly to undertake it [...] I would therefore submit to the consideration of congress the expediency and policy of erecting by their authority a society under the name ‘the American Academy for refining, improving, and ascertaining the English Language.’”

It was the timing of the *Thesaurus* that caused some of the criticism of both that volume and the antiquarian movement in general. Hickes’s *Institutiones* of 1689 on which the *Thesaurus* was based did not meet with the same kind of resistance that the *Thesaurus* did, because the language debates in England were not yet as developed in 1689 as they were in 1705. Many English writers were dismissive of the antiquarian efforts, and furthermore, the dismissal of the antiquarian enterprise by such men as Swift, Addison, Steele, and Pope arose from the connected debate concerning the “Ancients and Moderns.”

---

The violent disapproval of the antiquarian efforts, especially that directed at Hickes and Elizabeth Elstob, was driven by something much more practical than a theoretical debate, although it had its origins there, namely in the desire to improve language as a tool for effective and useful communication. I maintain that many English writers and thinkers, such as Swift, saw no utility to the English language in the antiquarian effort, and worse, they saw great harm in trying to provide open access to what they largely saw as “[...] the vulgar Tongue, so barren and so barbarous [...]”. The desire on the part of English thinkers and writers to improve utility in language, and their own inclinations towards classical rhetorical theories of language, led to the wholesale rejection of Hickes’ work, and that of the other antiquarian scholars.

Although Chapter 23 of the Thesaurus, “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons,” represents the first sustained attempt to apply a critical and theoretical apparatus to Anglo-Saxon poetry, it is dominated by Hickes’ attempts to sort out a “purer” language from the various dialects represented in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Hickes directly addresses two major Anglo-Saxon forms in Chapter 23, “pure Saxon” and “Dano-Saxon,” the lesser of the two languages, because of its “foreignness,” a key term for Hickes, who sought to separate out what he

---

133 Swift, A Proposal, 40.
134 Adams, in Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800, mentions that Hickes was a target in the Swift-Temple-Wotton debates on the Ancients and Moderns, and that Hickes is named in Wotton’s anti-Swift pamphlet, Remarks on the Tale of a Tub. She obliquely suggests that Swift’s real animosity toward Hickes was possibly rooted in Hickes’ political and religious pamphlets, not solely in his philological work, 75.
believed to be the true Anglo-Saxon from dialectical languages which he believed to have introduced “abhorrent” elements into Saxon poetry.

Ultimately, this desire of Hickes to divine the “purer” language with respect to the Anglo-Saxon reflects a more general eighteenth-century anxiety about the nationalistic uses of language and the attempt to control and modify the language, as in Swift’s *A Proposal for Correcting, Improving and Ascertaining the English Tongue*. Especially important was the linking of language to national identity and issues of nation building, as with the establishment of the Académie Française in 1635. This anxiety manifests itself in Swift as an attempt to purge the English language of “barbaric” elements, namely Germanic words and grammatical forms, placing him, and men like him, in direct opposition to the antiquarian movement headed by George Hickes and the group of Oxford Saxonists.
Chapter 4: “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons”

This chapter provides a translation of Hickes’s Chapter 23, dealing with the poetry of the Anglo-Saxons. This is the first sustained translation of this chapter, which has a unique place in the history of Anglo-Saxon studies, as it is the first analysis of Old English poetry and the first attempt to try to apply a theoretical framework to it. Hickes clearly wanted his readers to understand and enjoy the poetry, and he intended this chapter as an aid. Although his analysis is flawed at the core by the assumption that the poetry fits into the framework of classical poetry, it is the fact that it was even attempted that is so remarkable in this case.

The elements in script were scanned directly from the Thesaurus and included in this document. This was done with many of the longer passages and other assorted instances, such as the Augustan poetry that Hickes includes in this chapter, to save time and preserve the original feel of the chapter. In the sections dealing with the text of Cotton Caligula A.vii, the Anglo-Saxon text has been included in its entirety, but Hickes’s Latin translation of the Old English has been abbreviated. In this section, it is the Anglo-Saxon text that is the most important item, not the translation. I have translated the first sentence of each, but omitted the rest.
Chapter Twenty-three: On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons

I.

The poetic art of the Anglo-Saxons must be considered either with respect to the language in which the poems are written; or with respect to meter of which the whole method turns around feet or the quantity and measure of the syllables, which method distinguishes poems from things written in prose; or third with respect to rhythm, which consists of a system or collection of feet whose tempos have a certain relationship or fitting proportion to one another, constructed from the harmonious and consistent measure of diverse tempos or movements; or finally with respect to what occurs in poems, especially indeed that which renders things written poetically by the Anglo-Saxons so thorny and difficult to understand.

II.

As for the language in which the poems of the Anglo-Saxons are written, at least those that survive, either the Saxon language is purer, or the Dano-Saxonic dialect, which we have discussed sufficiently thoroughly in Chapters 20 and 21. The poems which are constructed in purer Saxon we reckon should be called Saxon poems, but those poems which are in the Dano-Saxonic dialect should be called Dano-Saxonic.
III.

Saxon poems, just like those things that are written in the purer type of prose, are generally free from strange words, as also from those barbarisms, which in Dano-Saxonic poems sometimes either distort the syntax itself or seem to distort it. Assuredly, they are not only generally free from strange words, but from those words which are alien to prose, except those which are common to Dano-Saxonic and Saxon poets, particularly those which are for the most part common to them along with the Francic harmony of the gospels entirely written in poetry, and with Cimbric poems also, which words we therefore judge should rightly be called poetic. Of this sort are those which follow:

metod, rodot, fold, mold, hæle, hæleð, gumrinc, firas, beadu, þrage, sund, sunð, meca, beorn, ussih or ussich, usser, hæðo, lixan, dogor, sigor, brego, werod, or weorod, egor, hadre, or hadro, sinc, sefa, ferhþe, feorh, torht, hild, tir, lago, mago, frea, eafora, liþ, liþa, balo, eorþre, list, godweb, hrusa. To these you may add words compounded from them: like beadu-rinc, mago-rinc, gum-rinc, et cetera, and words properly signifying some particular condition, state, or rank of men, metonymically applied for the purpose of signifying man by rank: like, eorle, beorn, leod, bear, gefere, Eld, þegn, scealc; as is noted in Chapter 21.

IV.

The most illustrious Christopher Rawlinson, born to promote good literature, gave us a book of Anglo-Saxon poems, the poetic translations of the Boethian
meters copied from the Cotton manuscript; of these a number are so pure that in them you may not come upon even one word abhorrent to prose, as in this passage which follows: page 153 of the Cottonian translations.

Thus, in that very long poem, which begins in the right-hand column of page 173, many consecutive lines occur in which you will not be able to discover even a single word unused by writers of prose: such as,

Thus in that sufficiently long poem, which begins on page 191 with the words *hwy ge æfre scylen*, only two words are to be read that are foreign to prose, *listas* and *rinca*. In that which follows in the left-hand column, page 192, likewise only two occur, *hælep* and *torht*. The one that begins in the right-hand column at the top of page 194 gives only four poetic words, *hælep, torht, hrusa, metod*. In the
poem, *homerus wæs eart*, page 197, you will find no words except those found in prose and purely Saxon, as also in the final poem, *hwæt ðu meaht ongitan*, you will find absolutely none except *hrusa* and *metod*. Of the same kind is that elegant poem in MS Vitellius D.20 in the Cotton Library, printed erroneously in Simeon of Durham’s history of Saint Cuthbert in the *Historiae Anglica*ae scriptores X, and more correctly in the same book at the end of Somner’s glossary. Accompanied by its translation, it is composed on the topic of the site of Durham and the saints’ relics that are kept there. With the translation and notes of the Reverend William Nicolson, Archdeacon of Carlisle, worthy to be honored by me with many titles, I place it here indeed as a bonus.

![Image of Old English text]
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Thus, all the hymns that are contained in Chapter 25, folio 41 of the Worcester manuscript that survives among Junius’s books in the Bodleian Library [MS. ...
Junius 121] are purely Anglo-Saxon; as is demonstrated by this rhythmical paraphrase of the doxology, customarily recited for the purpose of confessing the Triune God, which I present below as an example, even though not yet rendered in poetic form.

![Gloria Patri and Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto](image)

*Du cæpt propna ðæben.*  
*And geopna hynpe.*  
*Lifer lattep.*  
*Leóhter pealbend.*

*Gánder ð uplyn.  
And cæll eallg ðu lysteles on pólban.  
Spýhe reala cynna.*  
*And to-lýndobost hig.*  
*Śirōn on mæneg.  
Du gýnpóhlest ece gód.*  
*Cæll georcysta.*

*On jyx dægum.*  
*And on ðone ropóhan ðu génestlest.*  
*Da ðer gýnpóhbad ðin fægene peop.  
And ðu runnan ðæg.*

*Sýlf halgobest.*  
*And gýmpóhbest hine mænegum to helpe.*  
*Done heahan ðæg.*  
*Dealbað ð hipocriap.*  
*Cæll ða ðe cunnun cýnlíene beapar.*

*Dalynne heont lunan.*  
*And ðer hehtyan gebod.*  
*On ðpitthen namon.*  
*Se ðæg ðir gýnpóhbed.*

---

*†On gicæhede. The notable Somner perhaps has more correctly on geogœ, “in youth.”
**This chapter is titled De Officiis Diurnalium Nocturnalium Orarum.*
There is no Dano-Saxon barbarism in these examples, no shaky syntax, no words departing from the common use of those who wrote in prose, except one word, *breome* or *breoma* in the former, and *foldan* in the latter example.

Otherwise, in each the poem is as familiar in its language as prose, and equally easy to understand. The hand in which the poem concerning the site of Durham is written, or rather copied, seems to be of the twelfth century, following some exemplar of greater antiquity.
V.

So much for the Saxon poems. How much the Dano-Saxonic poems, composed by northern poets, differ from them, I have shown above in chapter 21, and it will be shown more completely in the course of what we will propound below concerning this matter. But although there is a great difference between them as regards the language, in meter, however, the two plainly agree, as will be easily apparent to the reader, even if he is a stranger to the poetics of the Anglo-Saxons, from the verses of each language that are set out below, divided up into separate lines accordingly as they are distinguished in the exemplars by punctuation. That reader will perceive in the examples given below that the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, both Saxon and Dano-Saxonic, consist of verses, or rather of verselets, of three, four, five, six, seven, eight, and sometimes of nine syllables, and even more, connected in an uncertain arrangement, but very elegantly and rhythmically. For the most part, one sees verselets of four and five syllables, with verses of fewer or more syllables interspersed at will, as it seems to me, and without rules. Indeed, in a few poems and in passages of poems, especially in asyndeton, where the feverish poet seems to hasten the discourse, one reads many four-syllable and five-syllable verselets in succession, with verses of more syllables infrequently inserted here and there: as is generally the habit for the translator of the meters of Boethius in the Cottonian versions, and not rarely in the case of Cædmon, page 72. This is demonstrated by the following poems,
which are placed here below separately, in the manner of Pindarics, to which they are hardly dissimilar.

VI.

Moreover, verses of six syllables occur more frequently than those of three syllables. Also, verses of seven and eight syllables are read more frequently than those of nine syllables, which indeed are rather rare. Verses exceeding nine syllables occur most rarely of all in the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, and perhaps are written erroneously without the metrical points by which they should be
separated into more lines, like the long line occurring above, elðeodigra edwit boledon hæpenra hosp.

VII

It is also sometimes difficult to know of how many syllables a line consists for a variety of reasons. First, because we are ignorant of the quantity of syllables, and hence do not know where two short syllables supply the place of one long syllable. Second, because we do not know the value of certain double vowels or diphthongs, such as ea, eo, io in these and similar words: steap, heofod, sweord, hleow, ðeow, breome, hio, fior. Third, because it is not agreed how words ending in a feminine “e” or an uncertain “e” are to be pronounced in poetry: for example, brohte, worhte, fæge, which perhaps are to be uttered metrically sometimes as monosyllables, sometimes as dissyllables. Among such cases it is uncertain, for example, whether the verse “hleowmago þeow” (Cædmon, page 36, line 8) should be reckoned as having four or six syllables; or whether “seow sæda fela” (page 35, line 14) has five or six syllables; or whether “heafod swima” (page 35, line 19) has four or five syllables; or finally, whether “sunu mid sweordes ecge” ought to be counted as a line of eight or of seven syllables. Similarly, it is uncertain whether “wæstmas brohte” (page 35, line 15) has three or four syllables; and whether “steape dune” (page 61, line 11) should be reckoned as having four or two syllables, which I can hardly believe.

VIII
Finally, in these poems, even if they clearly have about them the appearance of lyrics, there are no strophes, antistrophes, or epodes consisting of a certain number of lines which I have been able to identify; truly, if they exist, it will certainly be a more than Herculean labor to find them in books in which the writing is continuous.

Now, it seems worthwhile to confirm with more abundant examples that the poems which our ancestors composed in both Saxonic and Dano-Saxonic are composed in meter, and to make clearer how true the observations are which we have given and are about to give in the form of rules. Therefore I will add poems in both Saxonic and Dano-Saxonic, among which a great difference may be detected at first glance.
In the Cottonian manuscript and in Matthew of Westminster:

In the year 937, Anlaf, pagan king of the Irish and of many islands, invited by the Scottish king Constantine, entered the mouth of the River Humber with a strong fleet. The king of the English, Æthelstan, and his brother, Eadmund, went to meet him with an army in a place called Brunenburgh. Battle was drawn out from the beginning of the day until evening, and they killed five chieftains and seven dukes from the enemy fleet, and they shed more blood in that place than had ever been known to have been shed in any battle in England to that point. Forcing the kings Anlaf and Constantine to flee to their ships, they returned home in glorious triumph.

1 In the Cottonian manuscript gealgodon.
2 Cottonian manuscript heted.
3 Cottonian manuscript secga swate.
4 Cottonian manuscript guunan norþærne.
5 Cottonian manuscript wiges red.
6 Cottonian manuscript 7 langne.
7 Cottonian manuscript mycel scearpum.
8 Cottonian manuscript ear gebland.
9 But in the Cotton manuscript one reads brego.
In the Cotton manuscript *creat cnear on flod feorh generede swilce þær.*

2In the Cotton manuscript *hal.*

3*rinc.*

4*meaga*

5In the Cotton manuscript *geongne.*

6In the Cotton manuscript *bill geslihtes eald in wuda.*

7*here leafum.*

8*hlybban.*

9In the Cotton manuscript *dægled on garum.*

10In the Cotton manuscript *dareda.*

11In the Cotton manuscript *deopne.*

12*Diflig.*

13*Est yna.*

14*Bege ætrumne.*

15*hremige.*

16*hra bryttinga salowig padan ðone.*

17*ofor brade brimu.* These and the others previous appear in the Cotton manuscript.
Philosophia Cantans, in Metrorum Boethianorum Versionibus Cottonianis, p. 156.
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IX

It is clear from the examples above that the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, both those composed in Saxonic and those in Dano-Saxonic, are composed metrically and that they consist for the most part of verselets of three, four, five, and six syllables, of which the most conspicuous and clear are those of four syllables made up of two spondees and those of six syllables made up of three spondees.

For example:
Now when I say spondees, I am speaking indeed about true spondees, which consist of two long syllables according to the rules of prosody. For although the Anglo-Saxon poets may undoubtedly treat some syllables as common syllables, they do not however scorn the quantity of syllables in the manner of our present-day poets, who corrupt long syllables as they please, or rather those that are long by nature; and they make them short, or I may even say very short, as in these lines which are placed below.

Thus indeed our poets, and likewise foreign poets throughout all Europe — among whom there is a single law of poetry — observe a certain and definite number of syllables, without observing any quantity of syllables. Nowadays this alone makes a verse: whatever the nature and quantity of the syllables, it is reckoned to be a verse when they have heaped up a certain number of syllables. The observation of metrical feet is accordingly missing among today’s poems; if
they occur anywhere, it comes about purely by accident, not by craft or by effort, since it is lawful to put in syllables of whatever measure you wish in any place randomly, so that one could say about the verses of this century that they flow in only one foot. But in the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, as it is justifiable to believe, the quantity of syllables, or the usage of metrical feet is not neglected in this way, even if perhaps they do not observe the reckoning of poetic measures and quantities as strictly as the heroic Greek and Latin poets of old. Several reasons that are not to be scorned persuade me that they do observe this.

First, because they rarely end their verses with those pseudo-rhythms which are called rhymes, or with words making the same sound. I call them “pseudo-rhythms” since they are called rhythms even if they have absolutely nothing in common with them except that they supply the place of rhythm for ears corrupted by the tinkling of rhymes or by the vain repetition of the vulgar art of rhythm. Therefore, since the verses of the Anglo-Saxons are free practically everywhere from this pseudo-rhythm of sounds with like endings, it is an argument not to be discounted that they are made not only from feet that differ in their measures, but from that suitable and legitimate arrangement of metrical feet in which the power and the nature of the rhythm consists.

Second, this makes me believe it: the use in the Anglo-Saxons’ Pindarics, if I may so say, of that bold and liberal transposition of words that is most alien not only to the practice of those speaking simply, but also to that of those who speak ornately among orators. There would not be a need for this, as it seems, unless
some law of metrics requiring observation of diverse measures and feet
demanded it from poets. For all learned people plainly acknowledge that there is
a threefold arrangement of words in discourse: one, indeed, in the discourse of
those speaking and writing simply; another in rhetorical discourse; and a third in
poetic or metrical discourse. Of these, the first approaches closest to the natural
order of words, from which the second departs the more, and the third most of
all.

This threefold arrangement of words is clearly to be discerned in the
writings of the Anglo-Saxons, just as in those of all races. Among the Anglo-
Saxons orators, who also have their quantities, depart from the natural order of
words to a much greater extent than those speaking and writing simply or
without art or artifice; and poets likewise depart from the order in which orators
arrange words, to the same extent that the latter depart from the order used by
those speaking simply, without any quantity. However, why the poets of the
Anglo-Saxons did this can be assigned to no other cause, as it seems, than the one
that drove Greek and Latin poets to do the same: namely the law of meter, which
binds poets not only to an observation of tempos and feet, but requires them to
arrange them so they may have mutual agreement of the parts with one another,
whereby the lines may move harmoniously, and may have movements agreeing
with the emotions that a poet intends to arouse. Hence, as reason obliges us to
believe, there comes about in the poems of the Anglo-Saxons that arrangement of
words so far removed not only from the natural order but also from the
rhetorical order, that they make their discourse obscure and the mind of the poet
difficult to understand in them. This will be clear from one or two examples.

The Alfredian specimen of the true Caedmon in Bede, Historia ecclesiastica, book
IV, chapter 24.

On the metrical arrangement of words in this example, so removed from
the common order both of those who speak and those who write, Bede
commented thus when he had translated them: “This is the sense, but not the
order of the words which he [Cædmon or Ceadmon] sang in his sleep.”

Similarly, in the paraphrase of Genesis, page 71, line five:

“Afterwards, that most prudent son of David, the most glorious king, the
wisest of earthly princes, most high in worldly power, and most holy, and most
celebrated by men, constructed in that place a sacred palace for God at the
admonishments of the prophet — the greatest and most famous palace of those
that the sons of men and men scattered through the world ever completed with
their hands.”

Another passage from the paraphrase, page 62, lines 24 ff.
“With the fire standing on the pyre [the pile of wood], the Creator of the human race gladdened the heart of Abraham, the kinsman [uncle] of Lot, restoring to him his own son unharmed. Then that happy man, the brother of Haran, looking over his shoulder saw there a ram, standing not far away, entangled in a thorn bush, and immediately set it upon the pyre in the place of his son.”

From the paraphrase of Genesis, page 39, line 11.

“You will live blessed in my protection. If anyone of earth’s inhabitants causes you harm, I will pour forth my curse upon him with fury and with longlasting hatred.”

But whence, I ask, so outrageous an arrangement of words in discourse, namely the distancing and tearing away of adjectives from their substantives, of nouns from the verbs which they govern, and finally of prepositions from the nouns with which they are associated, against all order, if not for the sake of
meter and of harmonious quantities? But if a definite and predetermined number of syllables might alone suffice for the composition of a poem, with no consideration of their quantity, as with today’s poets, why would the poets of the Anglo-Saxons transpose the parts of speech to such a great extent, against the order of prose, when no cause compels them? Why, I say, would poetic discourse differ so much as concerns the arrangement of words, not only from simple discourse lacking quantities, but from oratory which has its own quantities, if it were lawful for the poets of the Anglo-Saxons (as it is for ours) to lengthen short syllables and to shorten long ones at will.

This third point also establishes that the poets of the Anglo-Saxons did not compose poems from syllables of whatever measure indiscriminately, as our poets do: their language does not consist of monosyllables, which are distinctly unsuitable for meter, to the same extent as the current vernacular, which abounds in monosyllables. On the contrary, it enjoyed an abundant provision of disyllables and polysyllables in both its nouns and its verbs, and likewise in its indeclinables; these were suitable for metric feet, as those well knew, who tasted the language on their first lips (as they say).

They converted monosyllables into disyllables and disyllables into polysyllables by a variation of verbs and of nouns through tenses and cases and by means of syllabic increases. For this purpose, patronymics, names referring to tribal affiliations, possessives, derivatives, compounds, and words derived from compounds are all suitable for poetry; in these Anglo-Saxon is rich to such an
extent that, emulating Latin, it seems to claim for itself second, or at least third place among languages, after Greek. Those who wrote poetry were not compelled in that language, as in ours, to pile up eight or ten monosyllables in a verse, and therefore there is no reason that they might neglect the quantity of syllables and metric feet much at all, as we may believe. The first and second sentences of the paraphrase of Genesis contain eight verselets, in which are counted 25 words, of which only eight are monosyllables; the rest are disyllables and trisyllables, as is seen below.

"It is a great duty for us to praise with words and with our minds the guardian of the heavens, glory of the [heavenly] hosts. He indeed is the omnipotent Lord, effective power and leader of all creatures."

For those for whom there is so great a choice of words suitable for meter, no necessity presses upon them to neglect the quantity of syllables and metrical laws, as it does for those who are, as it were, slaves to monosyllables and who reject poetic quantities and are opposed to the nature of poetry.
So much for meter, of which the entire nature consists in the quantity and measure of syllables, from which feet are made up. Now concerning rhythm, which originates from a suitable arrangement of the feet whose lengths are proportionate to one another. This suitable arrangement and proportionality of the feet in poetry is, as it were, the soul of meter, from which comes, if I may say so, not only the life but the beauty and the charm and indeed all that power by which poetry moves and soothes the spirit and the emotions and rises above all the power of prose; in a word, meter without rhythm makes the verse faulty, disorganized, and rough, as in this line, where feet differing in tempo are mixed with one another:

“Optime, maxime, quis nisi tu divum atque hominum rex?”

How awkward is the opening of this poem in which the movement and the beat of the feet badly and ineptly joined without the proportion of tempo offend the ears, not otherwise than the movement and clatter of a one-wheeled cart while it is being dragged or thrust forwards through ruts and rocks. But in the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, whether Saxonic or Dano-Saxonic, the reader will perceive almost anywhere a suitable arrangement of metrical feet in the verses and harmonious rhythm of quantities and tempos from this well-adjusted movement of poems, by which poems are recognized as soon as they are read, even by those not knowing beforehand that they are poems. Truly, when I was a novice in Saxon matters and had come in reading the Saxon Chronicle to the year 938, immediately from the graceful opening of the poem, which affected me through
the power of the rhythm, I perceived the discourse to be metrical, although it was written continuously, in the manner of prose. And indeed, although I was unaware of the meaning of the words then and also of the quantity of syllables and the tempos of the feet, nevertheless I perceived a certain graceful symmetry of the parts in this poem, and I understood what I had read to be verses from the power of the quantities which I did not perceive in the prose of other annals lacking metrical quantities. Similarly, who, even a stranger to Saxon, would not discern at first sight that the lines that follow are metrical from their well-adjusted movement and the harmonious arrangement of the words in there?

Excerpt from the paraphrase, page 28, line 14.

This man [Enoch] obtained a discharge in body from here, by the power of the Lord, so that he would not die by death like the men of this world, both young and old, when God at the same time takes away from them possessions and wealth and earthly resources and life. Truly, alive he departed this wretched life with the king of the angels and the Lord of Life in that apparel which his soul took before his mother brought him forth among men.
Surely if these lines and many others of this sort were not especially eurythmic, their mere progression would not please to such a degree someone ignorant of even the sense of the words and would not declare them to be poems to the ignorant and the knowledgeable alike.

It is a completely different matter in the poems of our time, from which rhythm is missing and likewise the observation of metrical feet. If these, indeed, were written out continuously without the pseudo-rhythm of homoioteleuton, or the endings which they call rhymes, anyone reading them will not realize that they are verses, even though he understands the language in which they are written as his own vernacular. Wherefore when the rhythm and symmetry of parts reveal themselves in Anglo-Saxon poems to someone reading and not understanding, it is clear that they constructed their verses by means of feet with the appropriate measure of syllables and tempos and arranged in the proper order; and that they took care of this above all, that in their poems the rhythm should be joined to the meter, as the soul is to the body.

XI.

From these examples which I have set forth from the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, it is understood that pentasyllabic verses enjoy dactylic quantities. Those verses that begin with a dactyl make the poem that the grammarians call Adonic, of which kind are, or at least seem to be, the ones of this sort which follow.
Indeed, I do not doubt but that in the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, all those feet which the masters call simple, and perhaps also those which they call compound, and the metrical system also might be explained perfectly, just as in Pindarics, if we only know the quantity of the syllables; ignorance of this one thing hinders us so that we are less able to reveal the secrets of Anglo-Saxon poesy, both metrical and lyrical, if I may so say.

As for this as it were Pindaric, or lyric, kind of poem, if the true Cædmon did not invent it at the dictation of the spirit, he at least used it at the dictation of the spirit after it had been previously invented by older poets, as is manifest from the fragment cited above. Now, I call lyric a kind of poem which, being suitable for the lyre and for singing on account of the innate quality and true nature of the poem, was customarily to be sung by the inspired poet, the singer of his own poems and odes. For this same man was taught by the instruction of the spirit both to compose poems and to sing them.

The same type of poem was also used by whichever of the Old Germans it was who composed that harmony of the four Gospels in Old Saxon, which is entitled the Book of Canute, in the Cotton Library, Caligula A.vii, item one. For even if that book may be written continuously in the manner of prose, without
metrical points, which customarily mark off the verses in codices written in
*scriptura continua*, nevertheless, it is understood from the movement and the
metrical procession of the discourse by which poems are especially distinguished
from prose that the poems which are read in it are of the Caedmonian kind.
THE BEGINNING OF THE BOOK

There have been many who have driven their minds to describe the Word of God, especially that mystery which the Lord Christ proclaimed with words among men and brought about with his deeds...
Then the adversary of Man, spitefully skilled, took him a third time up to a high mountain where he made him see the riches collected by the labor of miserable mortals...
ORATIO DOMINICA, CHAP. XIX

Our father, that is the father of us, who are men, you are

king in high heaven. May your name be sanctified in every word...

PETER ACKNOWLEDGING CHRIST, CHAP. XXXVII

You are, said Peter, the true son of the living Lord God,

Christ, eternal king, who created this light...
Then Judas hastened away from there, plotting evil and meditating cruel things against his own lord...

I discovered by chance a single leaf of a fragment of poetry composed in the same meter in a manuscript book of homilies in Semi-Saxon which exists in the Lambeth Library. The fragment now follows:
That skald, author of the book which is titled Hervor’s Saga (which the most distinguished Olaus Verelius edited), wrote his poems in a not very dissimilar meter, as is clear from that dialogue between Hervor and Angantyr, the ghost of her father, from whom, while standing near his tomb, she asks that he might give her the sword Tyrfing.
Hervor.

Wahadu Angantar,
Vekur pig Hervor
Einka dorher
Vefar Snafti.
Sel bu mir ur hange
Hordan 2 marku,
Dan er Snaftiurana
Slogu ; dvegar.
Hervardur, Hiorvardur,
Brani, oc Angantar,
Dek eg sdr alla,
Vidar under renum.
Med hislni oc brini
Vs buksu svedi,
Raud oc reida,
Vs rodnum geiri.
Er miog voedHER.
Andgrymn syner
Mein giarnar ad
Molldar auka!
Ad engi gior sora
Hvor viid mig mala
Dr munar heimi!
Hervardur, Hiorvardur,
Su so sdrur einnum
Innan viia
Sem er s mauna
Vonsh hangi,
Nam sved felier,
Had er flogu dvegar
Samyra draugum;
Dyr um seela.

Angantyr.
Hervor dotter
Huj kallar suo,
Full sekiausafa,
Ser bu ad illu?

S Gortu ordin,
Oc osita,
Dill higgandi
Dekia barda memn.
Grofu mig eg fader
Nie frandur ader.
Dek hau fun Torsing
Tuir er lispu,
Vad Dg eigandi
Ein af sidan.

Hervor.
Sarr meler hu ecki
So lai 7 As bigi.
Heiln thangi,
Sem bu hafir egi
Torsing meyt per.
Traerti fier ad veita
Asf Angantar
Einka earn.
ANGANTYR.

Seige eg þier, Hervor,
Hod rera mun,
Sa mun Tjósungur
(Êf du trau máerar)
Ar Dinni nár
Allka spila.
Minnu þin yfera
Pan sökar mun.
Tjósing hafa,
Öc truu marger.
Hann manu Heidrek
Leita lyser.

HERVOR.

Nabar þurur Þur,
Mennakri rifknam
ður eg sál
þyra nána.
Sel du mikr ur háugi
pan er hatar brintu
*Suerga sníði,
Suger Þier er ad lei.

ANGANTYR.

Nargar eiguði,
Þur du ad augam
Jéld hýpar,
Beldur við eg sûðd þier
Selja ur háugi,
Mæl en uðga,
Mun eg hit epleina.

HERVOR.

Vul gjóður du,
Vikings náður,
Er du söddí mier
Sæður ur háugi.
Bæur þiðumst nu,
*þiðafungur, hafa,
Hun eg þóreina
Mæl allar.

ANGANTYR.

Vafsi er ad
þyppu host,
Mála, færad hónin,
Hun du fagna sál.
Sa mum Tjósungur
(Êf du trau náður)
Nurt þinu mar
Alltr spíla.

HERVOR.

Eg mun híða
Óc í hauð nema
*Bussan máli,
Éf eg hafa snáði
Hugg eg eige
Éfló brenna hana.
Ér frumblinum fíðum
Leikur um sóner.

ANGANTYR.

Reinsk eri Hervor,

I will tell thee, Hervor, what will come to passe: this Tjósing will, if thou dost believe me, destroy almost all thy offspring. thou shalt have a son, who afterwards must possess Tjósing, and many think that he will be called Heidrek by the people. Hervor. I do by enchantments make, that the dead shall never enjoy rest, unless Angantyr deliver me Tjósing. 

ANGANTYR. Young maid, I say, thou art of manlike courage, who dost robe about by night to tombs with spear enbraged with magical spells, with helmet, and coat of mail before the door of our hall. Hervor. I took the for a brave man, before I found out your hall, give me out of the tombe the workmanship of the dwarfs, which hates all coats of mail; it is not good for the to hide it. Angantyr. The death of Díalmar lies under my shoulders, it is all wraped up in fire; I know no maid in any country that dares this sword take in hand. Hervor. I hall keep, and take in my hand, the sharp sword, if I may obtain it. I do not think that fire will burn, which plays about the sight of deceated men. Angantyr. O conceited Hervor, thou art mad, rather than thou in a moment shouldst fall into the fire, I will give thee the sword out of the tomb, young maid, and not hide it from thee. Hervor. Thou didst well thou offspring of heroes, that thou didst send me the sword out of the tomb. I am now better pleased, O Prince, to have it, than if I had got all Norway. Angantyr. Fals woman, thou dost not understand, that thou speakest foolishly of that, in which thou dost rejoice. for Tjósing hall, if thou wilt beleive me, maid, destroy all thy offspring. Hervor. I must go to my leamen.
Here I have no mind to stay longer. Little do I care, O Kopyall freind, what my sons hereafter quarrell about. Angantyr. Take and keep Hialmars bane, which thou shalt long have and enjoy. Touch but the edges of it, there is poysen in both of them, it is a most cruell devourer of men. Hervor. I shall keep, and take in hand, the sharp sword, which thou hast let me have: I do not fear, O slain father! what my sons hereafter may quarrell about. Angantyr. Farewell daughter, I do quickly give the twelve mens death, if thou canst belede with might and courage. even all the gods, that Andgrynys sons left behind them. Hervor. Dwel all of you safe in the tombe, I must be gon, and hasten hence, for I seem to be, in the midst of a place where fire burns round about me.
XIII.

Thus far we have discussed the poems of the Anglo-Saxons with respect to language, with respect to meter, and with respect to rhythm, having no guide we might follow in these pathless places, although we will have many who will follow us with greater success, which we desire. Now, truly, let us progress to those things which are coincidental in their poems, among which the first which offers itself for observation is the not infrequent use of words beginning with the same initial, which seems to increase and, in a certain way, to govern the harmony of the poem. Now in this matter the Anglo-Saxons copy the Greeks and the Latins, just as our poets copy the Anglo-Saxons; or rather with the Muses themselves in charge, they all do the same thing, since that concord of initials is heard in all poems of all peoples, as the following examples show.

Ex Pindaro.

Πάντως πέρπον. ὁ Ἀράχος, ἔλειον
Κάθεμαι κήριη. Ἀνεχθής φυγή.

Ex Homero.

Ἄμπηλ ὁ πάντοι ἐχθρός ὁ Ἀράχος Ἀραμίλλη
Πέτρον προέρχεται.

Ex Hesiodo.

'Ἄρτερ' ἄμηπτο, ἄστυ ἢ δυσμενὸν. Ἄλιθ ἢ ἀμαξωρίς ἀπεκάθισε πολλὰ. Πνεῦμα τής ἐποχῆς ἢ τής ἀλαθῆς Ἀλομ.ι.

Ex Dionysio Characeno.

Καισαριέ σᾶμα χρυσα καλλικόνιον κοιλαφέρα.
Δείκ {τ} ἐπιζήμων ἢ τή ἀλαθῆς Ἀλομ.ι.

Ennius.

Brundisium pulcro praecinctum præpete portu.
The same characteristic of poetry is to be observed in Icelandic poems, as can be seen in all the verses of the *Voluspa*, where the initial letters govern the harmony. For the sake of example I set forth these lines:

Digby 4, is discerned a mutual relation of the initials, for example:

Similarly, our own foremost poets, for example that celebrated satire writer who calls himself Piers Plowman:
In a somer season, when set was the sunne,
I hope me into byroubs, as I a hope were,
In habite as an harmet, ungody of werkis,
Went lydde in this world, wonders to hear.
And on a day morning, on Palverne hills,
We befell a serly, of farty me thought,
I was weary of wandering, and went me to rest.
Under a brode benk by a hourene side,
And as I leamd and loknd on the water,
I slumbred into a sleping, it * swyped to merye.

Chauceru.

It is full harde to halten unespyed,
Before a crepil, for he can the craft.
Creslide when the rely was to ride
Full sorrowfully he sighed, and sad alas.
And he full soft and slighly gan her seie
Powy hold your day, and doe me not to dreie.

Spenceru.

Her banton Palfrey all was overspried
With tinsel trappings, wbben like a wabe.
Whilese briel seirng with golden belts and bosse brave.
As where th' Almighty's lightning brand do's liht
It dim's the dazled eyne, and daunts the tensees quite.
So far as both the doughter of the day
All other lesser lights in light excell.
Thus, the Anglo-Saxon poets, likewise inspired by the Muses, enjoyed the harmony of words beginning with the same initial letters. Of this kind are these lines of the true Caedmon, inspired by the Spirit: *herigan heofon rinces weard*.

*Metodes mihte 7 his mod gedanc. Weorc wulder fæder. Firum foldan. frea ælmhtig. So too, in the pseudo-Caedmon, these lines *metod mancyymes. Fira æfter foldan, which may be read above, and these lines set down below: æhta 7 ætwist, fola frum beawæ, wis 7 willan, sweart under swegle, dome 7 dugeðe, feoh 7 fuglas, laðra lind, beorht blisso ðegnas ðrymfæste firena fremman, ræran on roderum, side and swegletorht. wefan 7 weccean, wlte 7 wuldre, earce from eorþum, ær to mannum modor brohte.*
demdon dugeðum, mid grim grire, brad 7 bresne. bearna tudre, rædfært redran 7 recene
genam, holm wæs heonon weard, afer stream-staðe stæwwan moston. wuldres ealdor
wurd to Noe, tymað nu tiedrað. tires brucað, beagas from Bethlem. 7 botl gestreon, and
600 others.

To these can be added similarly sounding parts of the same verse, for example in Pseudo-Caedmon: wide and side. gleam 7 dream. on gewald gestald.
geseah deorc weorc. lædað 7 fædað. frede7 nerede. lisse 7 blisse. sceapes 7 geapes. or ne fore. and in others of this sort. Rhetoricians and grammarians of the Greeks call this assonance of words in one and the same verse which they note to be among the vices of poetry, as Eustathius in that verse of Homer’s Iliad, Ψ, verse 116.

Ποιδὶ δ’ ἢναγε, κάτανε, πίεινε πε, δεμμα τ’ ἔλθον.

But although this assonance is deservedly to be condemned in Greek and Latin epics, nevertheless in Anglo-Saxon poems, which are of another innate quality and structure, it brings attractiveness, splendor, and sometimes majesty to metrical discourse, when inserted here and there like a harmony of sounds, for the purpose of restoring the spirit and stirring the emotions.

From these there is sometimes a progression to words sounding and ending similarly at the end of certain verses, or to those homoioteleuta which our poets call rhymes, as in the fragment of the true Caedmon “middangeard. mancynnes weard”; and in the fragment of the story of Judith “swylce eac rede streamas. 7 swegles dreamas”; and in Pseudo-Caedmon 42, 10, 20: “seo wæs
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waetrum weaht. 7 waestmum ðeaht. lago streamum leoht.” But these and others of this sort, although occurring most rarely, were perhaps the beginnings of rhymes at the end of the verses, which, as the purer Saxon fell apart as time progressed, to some extent offset the loss of true rhythm, as will be shown in the next chapter.

XIV.
Now it remains that we pass on to transmitting those points which render the poems of the Anglo-Saxons so obscure and so difficult to understand that they lie everywhere neglected and unstudied by lovers of Saxon, with whom I therefore hope I will win favor, if I can set the poems of the Anglo-Saxons in lunar splendor even if I will not be able to bathe them in solar splendor. In order to rescue them from their almost Cimmerian darkness, and from the dense night in which they are shrouded, I will put down in order all those points that contribute something to that darkness, among which words alien to common speech hold the first place; but these we dealt with in the next to last chapter, to which I refer the reader.

XV.
After words, we come next to transpositions of words, which we discussed above. Therefore, the reader who may wish to read the poets with profit should
in the second place carefully investigate the common and more natural order of words, as being that which is necessary for finding the grammatical construction of the words in the discourse and for correctly grasping the sense of the author. And indeed when the arrangement of the words in the metrical discourse has been converted to the simple and more natural order, the true construction will be clear, as it were from itself; and from the construction, the mind of the poet will be clear, as these examples show:

\[Nu\ we\ sceolon\ herigean,\ heofon\ rices\ weard,\ metodes\ mihte\ 7\ his\ mod\ gedanc\ [7],\ weorc\ wuldor\ fæder,\ swa\ he\ wundra\ gehwæs,\ he\ ord\ [7]\ ece\ drihten\ onsteald.\ he\ eordan\ bearnum\ to\ rofe\ heofon\ halig\ scippend\ ærest\ scop,\ ða\ firum\ foldan\ middan\ geard\ moncynnes\ weard\ [7]\ ece\ drihten\ [7]\ frea\ Ælmihtig\ æfter\ teode.\]

In this example of the true Caedmon, first the words which are foreign to common speech should be examined according to the preceding rule, such as *metodes*, *ord*, *firum*, *foldan*, *frea*. For their meaning, chapter 21 should be consulted with the help of the little index. Having discovered the meanings of the words, they should next be put back in common order in this way: “*Nu heaefon rices weard metodes mihte 7 hi mod gedanc [7] weorc wuldor fæder we herigan sceolon swa wundra gehwæs he ord [7] ece drihten onsteald. he eordan bearnum to rofe heofon halig scippend ærest scop. ða firum foldan middan geard moncynnes weard [7] ece drihten [7] frea Ælmihtig æfter teode.*”

So too in the fragment of the History of Judith:
And ða fromlice lind wiggende lædan ongunnon ða torhtan mægð to træfe ðam
hean ðær se rica hyne reste on symbol nihtes inne nergende lað Holofernus. Ðær
wæs eall gylden floehnet fæger 7 ymbe ðæs folctogan bed ahongan þæt se bealo
fulla mihte wlitan ðurh wigena baldor on æghwylcne de ðær inne com hæleða
bearna 7 on hyne nænig monna cynnes nympe se modiga hwæne niðe rofra him ðe
near hete rinca to rune gegangan.

In these two sentences, the words from which common speech shrinks are lind, in
the compound lindwiggende, torht, toga, in folctogan, træfe, bealo, baldor, hæleð, nyme, rof rinc. All should be sought out ins the little index joined to our grammar. Once
the meanings of the words have been discovered, the grammatical structure can
be discovered from the simple word order in use among those speaking simply
and plainly; this is of this kind:

7 ða lindwiggende ða torhtan mægð fromlice lædan ongunnon to tham hean træfe.
ðær inne on symbol nihtes hyne reste nergende lað holofernes. Ðær wereall
gylden fæges fleoh-net. 7 ymbe ðæs folc-togan bed ahongan þæt on hæleða bearne
æghwylcne de ðær inne come miht ðurh witan se bealo fulla witgena baldor 7 on
hyne nympe hwæne niðe rofra rinca him ðe near hete se modiga to rune gegangan

“Then truly the military men diligently began to lead the matchless
maiden to the lofty tent, where the odious lord Holofernes was always

155 In Greek and Latin verses, pseudo-rhythm may sometimes occur among the most ancient
poets, formed from the caesura and the ending, as for example
Homer: 

in the habit of sleeping at night. In that place was a splendid canopy of
gold, which was hung around the bed of the commander so that that
detestable general might be able to observe each man [all men] who might
enter; but nobody dared to observe him except whichever of the more
distinguished men he might order to approach close to him in order to
whisper to him.”

fromne folctogan. fyrd gebeodan. Orlahomar.* In this section a single word is poetic, to
be searched for in the little index, namely *aldor.* Then the construction should be
established in this placement of words: *Đa gefrægn ic Elamitarna aldor fromne
folctogan Orlahomar fyrd gebeodan.*

“Then I heard Orlahomar, King of the Elamites, that vigorous leader,
enlisting an army.”

Likewise in the paraphrase, 47: *hwæt gifest ðu me. gasta waldend. freo manna. to
frofre. nu ic þus. fea sceaf þeom. ne þearfe ic yrfe stol. eaforan bytlian. ænegum minra. ac

---

One may also find other, similar, verses. Of this kind are those Neronians by Persius in his first
satire. “This type of poem (says Casaubon in his commentary on Persius) was found so
acceptable when barbarism took over the kingdom widely, that all the communities of monks
were filled up with poems of the same stuff.” Casaubon assigns the corruption of the Latin to the
same origin to which we assign that of the Saxon poetry. “Therefore, through the fault and
affectation of a few dabblers, true and legitimate poetry had been corrupted from those
beginnings, and gradually, with the number of unskilled people increasing, and with solid
learning languishing and finally disappearing, corruption and dissimulation began to take the
place of true poetry.”
me æfter sculon. mine woruld magas. welan bryttian. Here, eaforan, magas, and bryttian are poetic. The more common and grammatical order is: gasta waldend.

hwæt freo manna gifest dü me to frofre ne ðearfe ic ænegum minra eaforan yrfestol bytlían. ac mine woruld magas sculon æfter me welan bryttian, nu ic ðus fea sceaf eom.

“O Lord of spirits, what children will you give me in compensation? For I do not hold it necessary to build for one of my sons a hereditary house, but my kin, when I have died, will seize my wealth since I am bereft of children.” Thus, 25, 11, hine waldend on. tirfæst metod. tacen sette. freoðo beacen frea. ðy læs hine feonda hwilc. mid guð þræce. gretan dorste, feorran ðode nean. Here, tirfæst, metod-frea, guð, þræce, alien from the common speech, are to be sought in chapter 21. The grammatical order on the other hand is this: waldend, tirfæst metod. frea on hine freoðo beacen tacn sette. ðy læs feonda hwilc feorran ðode nean hine mid guð þræce gretan dorste. “The Lord, the most powerful creator and prince, put on him [Cain] a sign of liberty, a mark, lest any enemy far off or near might dare to challenge him in combat.”

XVI.

Third, circumlocutions and tropes obscure the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, just like those of Pindar, namely metaphors, synecdoche, metonymy, and the multiplication of tropes on the same words which they call metalepsis. To these things the reader must diligently attend, so that he may read the poets with

156 These are the words of Abraham, complaining that he is childless.
profit. Thus, the sea is named *hron-rade*, “road of the whale,” *ganotes bæð*, “bath of water-fowls,” *hwæles æþel*, “homeland of the whale.” And fish of the sea are called *brim hlæst*, “wages, or profit, of the sea.” Caedmon 5, 9, *Inc sceal sealt wæter. wunian on gewealde. 7 eall worulde gescaeft. brucað blæd daga. 7 brim hlæste. 7 heofon fugla. Inc is halig feoh. 7 wilde deor. on geweald geseald. 7 lifigende. ða ðe land tredað.*

feorh eaceno cynn. ða ðe flod wecceð. geond hron rade. *Inc hyrað eall, “The sea will remain in your power, with every worldly creature; enjoy the fruit of the days and the fish and the fowls of the sky. The pure cattle, likewise the untamed beasts are given into your power, animals both viviparous which tread the earth and those which waves move through the ocean.” The Saxon Chronicle of Gibson, annal 975: ða wearþ eac adræfed. deormod hæleð. Orlac of earde. ofer yða gewealc. ofer ganotes bæð. gamol feax hæleð. wis 7 word snotor. ofer wætera geþring. ofer hwæles æþel. hama bereafod. “Then the most beloved chief Oslac, the old white-haired one, wise and prudent in speech, was driven out of his native land by rolling waves, by the bath of the water-fowls, by the crash of water, by the homeland of the whale, deprived of his home.” Caedmon, 34, 17, *eow is eðel-stol. holmes hlæst. 7 heofon fugla. 7 wilde deor. on geweald geseald. eorþe ælgrene. 7 eacen feoh, “To you, your native country is the most flourishing land, the fish and the fowl of the sky, and the wild beasts and fruitful cattle are handed over into your power.” Thus, “soul” is called *breosta hord*, “treasure of the chest,” and “lineage, race, or family,” *heorþ-werod, “hearth-band,” Caedmon 36, 13-14 and 45, 3.*

157 I. e., “have dominion over.”
Likewise, 73, 24 “spirit” or “mind” is called banhuses weard, “the guard of the bonehouse.” gif onlucan wile. lifes wealhstod. beorht in breostum. banhuses weard. gifæsten god. gastes cægon, “If the truthful God, bright in the chest, negotiator of life, is willing to unlock the mind with the keys of the spirit.”

Thus the surface or the exterior part of the earth is called by Cædmon tiber-seaca, that is “shaker of offerings,”158 because to those who cultivate it, it offers its fruits like presents and gifts. ða seo tid gewat ofer tiber-seacan middan-geardes, “afterwards this day passed over the surface of the earth.” Likewise, “sun” is called folca frið-candel, “the candle animating man159,” 55, 5, and godes candel beorht in the Saxon Chronicle of Gibson annal 938. It is also simply called wuldor torht, “surpassing glory,” 61, 24. The sea, on account of its spherical swelling, is called holm, “hill, mountain”: as oferholmes hring,160 “through the circuit of the sea.” So too “war” is called here and there by poets, æsc-plega,

158 Among the Greek poets “gaia” is called, in the same way μνησιμετάζων, ψειδίζομεν, πολύβεβλησθεν, ἐλειώμενον, φυσίζομεν, ἀνέλεσθεν, ἔρωτισθεν, πολύβεβλησθεν, κτλ. None of these epithets rise to the Caedmonian boldness. Only Callimachus affects something similar, who calls “gēn” γενάλευσων. I do not know whether Caedmon may allude to sacrifices of agitation.
159 Orpheus names the sun with almost the same trope.
160 This metaphor the most learned Olaus Verelius, in his notes to Hervarar Saga, chapter one, points out to have been familiar to men of old who were in the habit of calling the sea belte because it constricts on all sides, surrounds, and binds the continental land and islands, as in this phrase, laugur er landa belte “the sea is the belt of the lands”; whence the ocean is called by the Greeks laieoxos. There also he cites the poem of einarr Skulason skaldi from the Lexicon of the great Olaus the Icelander, in which the sea on four occasions is called beltte, that is, “belt.” On four occasions likewise it is called linda, that is, “band”; on six occasions gyrdill, gyrd, videgyrdell, that is, “girdle”; on three occasions similarly vinigord, that is, “belt or sheath”; on four occasions sile, that is, “yoke”; one time baugur, that is, “ring”; men on four occasions, that is, “collar”; helse similarly one time, that is, “necklace”; fiotur on two occasions, that is, “shackles”; and hringur two times, that is, “ring.” From belte moreover, the Baltic Gulf received its name. To this pertains the Icelandic Eddic myth of Jormungandus, “for a snake encircling the sphere of the world,” concerning which see also myth 41.
“shield-play,” heard handplega, “hard hand play,” and in the fragment of the history of Judith, page 24, “arrows” are called hilde nedra, “military serpents.”

Le Toni ford fleogan flana scuras. hilde næðran, “they made fly showers of arrows, those military serpents.” Thus “soldiers” are called hilde wulfs, Pseudo-Caedmon, 14, 8. Thus from hleo or hleow which firstly signifies a place free from sun and wind, and next means “asylum, refuge, house,” and from maga, “son,” we get hleo-magas, “brothers,” that is “sons of the same house,” Caedmon 25, 25 and 36, 8. Are ne wolde. gesceawian. ne ða sceonde huru hleo-magum helan, “he did not want to show reverence nor to hide shameful things from his brothers.” Thus page 36, cwæþ he wesan sceolde. hean under heofnum. Cham on eorðan. hleo-maga theow, “he said that Ham, while he lived, would be the servant of his brothers under high heaven.” Hneo-maga means the same, from the Cimbric hneo, “generation,” and maga, “son.” Thus, frod fyrn dagum, wintrum frod, misserum frod, “wise in the passage of days, wise in years,” mean “old man” here and there. To this pertain Engla helm for “God,” and gumena Baldor, Æþelinga helm, Synces brytta, and metaphorical circumlocutions of this kind signifying “king,” as well as many others of this sort.

XVII.

Fourth, asyndetic discourse, whereby nouns and verbs, as if having two faces, both look back to what went before and look ahead to what follows, can cause delay and effort to the readers of the poets. For example, in the paraphrase of
Genesis, 8,3: se feond mid his geferum eallum. feollon þa ufon of heofnum. ðurh longe swa preo niht 7 dagas. ða englas of heofnum on helle. 7 heo alle forscop drihten to deoflum, “that evil demon, with all his companions, fell for three long days and nights, from above, out of heaven; that is, the angels from heaven into the underworld, every one of whom God changed into devils.” So too in the fragment of the history of Judith: De us manna mæst morþra gefremede sarra sorga, “who especially has perpetrated murder among us, and grievous evils.” Likewise in the paraphrase of Genesis, 25, 13-14: Heht ða from hweorfan. meder 7 magnum. man scyldigne. cnosle sinum, “then, he ordered the evil one to depart from his mother and brothers and his kin.” So also in the Calendar: hafuc sceal on glofe. wild gewunian. wulf sceal on bearowe. earn on haga. eofor sceal on holte. top mægenes trum, “the hawk on the slopes, the wolf in the forest, the eagle in the fields, and the boar strong of tusks, will remain wild beasts in the wood.”

XVIII.

To these examples should be added the placing together of nouns in asyndetic discourse, especially of synonyms referring to the same thing. Thus in the fragment of the history of Judith: het ða niþa geblonden ða eadigan mæþ ofstum fetigan to his bed-reste beagum gehlæste hringum gehrodene, “Then the corrupt man ordered the blessed maiden to be brought to his litter, loaded with bracelets, laden with rings.” So also in Caedmon’s paraphrase, 51, 12: of ðam leod fruman. brad folc cumað. brego wearda fela. rofe arisad. rices heardas. woruld-cyningas. wide
mære, “From that patriarch, a vast people will arise, kings of many leaders, noble shepherds of the kingdom, most celebrated kings of the world will be raised up.”
Likewise 14, 12: *Ic hebbe me fæstne geleafan. up to tham ælmihtegan gode. ðe me mid his earmum worhte. her mid handum sinum,* “Loyal faith I place in God omnipotent, who has created me here with his arm and with his hands.” So too, 25, A 4: *ic his blod ageat. dreor on eordan,* “I have shed his blood, gore upon the earth.” also 26, 1: *oð þæt aldor gedal. frod fyrn dagum. fremman sceolde. lif of lætan,* “until the old man has suffered separation of life, has abandoned life.” So too 26, 9: *ða his wifum twæm. wordum sægde. Lameh seolfa. leofum gebeddum,* “then Lamech himself spoke with words to his two wives, beloved consorts of the bed.” Likewise above: *ofer yða gewealc. ofer ganotes bæð. ofer wætora geþring. ofer hwæles æðel. Asyndeta are very common, for example: ðegnas ðrymfæste. ðeoden heredon. sægdon lustum lof. heora liffrean. demdon drihtnes duguðum. wæron swide gesælige. synna ne cuðon. firena fremman,* “the most magnificent ministers were praising the king, eagerly they were singing praises to the Lord of their life, they were truly blessed, they did not know how to commit shameful sins.” So too 42, 24: *wunode síddan. be lordan. gera mænego. ðær folc stede. fægre wæron. men arlease. metode laðe. wæron Sodomisc cynn. synnum driste. dædum gedwolene. drugon heora selfra. ecne unræd,* “the race of Sodomites afterward lived where there were beautiful cities, shameful men, bold in sinning, and erring in their actions they earned punishments for their foolishness.” So too, 5,1: *of ðam worhte god. freolicu fæmnan. feorh in dyde. ece saula,* “from which God created freeborn woman, imparted life, eternal soul.”
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Fifth, among the Anglo-Saxon poets, especially those writing in Dano-Saxonic, verbs in asyndetic discourse often have a participial sense, and are to be translated by participles or connective conjunctions. This can cause delay for the reader unfamiliar with metrical discourse. Thus in Caedmon’s paraphrase 6, 23: 

*ne mihte him bedyrned weorðan. þæt his engil ongan. nolde gode ðeowian. cwæð þæt his lic wære. leoh 7 scene. hwit 7 hiow-beorht*, which I translate as follows: “it could not be concealed from him that his angel began to be proud, raising himself against his own lord, seeking hateful conference, undertaking boastful words, being unwilling to serve God, but saying that his body was light and bright and his form clear.” It is as if it had been written [using the participles] *ahebbende, secende, onginnande, nillende, cwæpende*. So too 80, 18: *ða se lig gewend. on laðe men. hæðne of halgam. hyssas wæron bliðe mode. burnon scealcas. ymb ofn utan alet. gehwearf teon-fullum on teso*, “Then the flame, sent out beyond the furnace and returning dangerously to the right, twisted itself away from the holy ones onto the hateful heathens, with the boys rejoicing, and the slaves [villains] burning.” So indeed I think that passage should be translated, as if it had been written thus: *ða se lig ymb utan ofn alet. 7 gehwearfende teon fullum on teso on laðe men hæðne se gewand. ða hyssas bliðe mode wæron 7 scealcas burnon*. Likewise 9, 10: *Næfð he ðeah. riht gedon. þæt he us hæfð befrielled. fyre to botme helle ðære hatan. heofon rice benumen. hæfað hit gemearcod. mid moncynne. to gesettanne*, “Not, however, that he did a just thing,
because he has cast us headlong into the lowest part of the inferno, and has
deprived us of the heavenly kingdom, and he has decided to establish it with the
gecoren. drohtad secan. fleah wær-fæst wean. wæs þæt wite to strang. Abraham
maðelode. geseah Egypta. horn sele white. 7 hea byrig. beorhte blican, “Then wise
Abraham, led by the Lord, went into Egypt to seek a living, prudently fleeing
misery while the suffering of famine prevailed; moreover, seeing the white roofs
of palaces and lofty cities shining brightly, Abraham began to speak.” So too 42,
1: ðær se eadga eft. ecan drihtnes. niwan stefne. noman weordade. til-modig eorl. tiber on
sægde. ðeodne Engla. ðancode swiþe. lifes leohtfruman. lisse 7 ara, “There the blessed
one, the good one, the hero, was adoring the name of the eternal Lord with a new
prayer, making sacrifice to the King of the Angels and giving thanks to the
Author of Life, on account of his deliverance and the things necessary for
preserving his life.” Or thus, with a connecting conjunction: “There the blessed
one, and the good hero was adoring the name of the eternal Lord with a new
prayer and was making sacrifice to the King of Angels, and was giving thanks to
the Author of Life on account of his deliverance and the things necessary for
preserving his life.” So too, 45, 5: Him da Abraham gewat. 7 da eorlas þry. de him ær.
treowe sealdon. mid heora. folce getrume. wolde his mæg huru. Loth alynnan, “Then
Abraham, wishing to free his relative from slavery at all events, departed with
three leaders who gave their loyalty to him with their troops.” So too 47, 14: ða
gen Abrahame. eowde selfa. heofona heah cyning. halige spræce. trymede tilmodigne. 7
him to weordode. Meda syndon. micla ðīna, “Then again the exalted King of Heaven revealed himself to Abraham, strengthening the good man with holy speech, and saying to him, great are your rewards.” So too in the Saxon Chronicle of Gibson, annal 975: her geendode. eorþan dreamas. Eadgar Engla cyning. Ceas him ofer leoh. wlitig 7 winsum. 7 ðis wace forlet. lyf ðas læne nemnað. leoda bearn. men on moldan, “In this year, Eadgar, King of the English, ended earthly triumphs, choosing another light for himself, beautiful and joyous, and abandoning this impermanent life, which the children of the nations call transitory, men dwelling on earth.” Alternatively by means of the connective: “and he chose and he abandoned.” Cædmon’s paraphrase, 52, 7: gewiton him ða. ædre ellor fuse. æfter ðæ spraece. spedum feran. of þam hleoðor stede. halige gastas. lastas legdon. him wæs leohes mæg. sylfe on gesiððe. oð þæt hie on Sodoman. weall-steape burg. wlitan meahton. gesawon ofer since. salo hlifian, “Then the holy spirits\textsuperscript{161} heading elsewhere after this talk quickly departed, hurrying from the place of prophecy, the son of light himself being their companion,\textsuperscript{162} until they looked upon Sodom, a city having high walls, beholding the palaces shimmering with gold.” Now it should be observed here that the participle, by which the verb is to be rendered in asyndeta, should sometimes be put into the ablative absolute; as above, burnon sealcas, “with the slaves burning.”

\textsuperscript{161} The three angels speaking with Abraham.
\textsuperscript{162} Namely the third Angel, who was manifesting himself as the eternal \textit{logos} as a prelude to the incarnation. The uncreated Angel. The Angel of the covenant.
XX.

Certain apparent violations of the syntax can delay the reader not versed in poetics; however, seeming to be such, they truly are not. They are of this kind. First compound substantives, of which the first element, seeming to be possessed by the second, should evidently be put in the genitive: for example, wuldor cyning, woruld cyining, heofen rice, folc gestael, heofon stolas, “heavenly seats,” swegl-bosmas, “bosom of heaven,” leodsceapa, “enemy of the human race,” hellsceaða, “hellish enemy,” sorgword, “sorrowful words, complaints,” eorðrice, “dominion of earth,” handsceaf, “work of the hand,” handgeweorc, the same, aerendsæcg, “herald of the messengers” “envoy,” modsorg, “sorrow of the spirit,” and many others of this kind. Because they are not written with a hyphen, they seem to be set in place of wuldores or wuldres cyning, woruldes cyning, folces gestæl. Second, the ending of nominative singulares of the second declension in –an, as in these Cædmonian lines: ðu eart hæleða helm. 7 heofen deman. engla ord-fruman, “You are the crown [king] of the princes, and the heavenly judge, creator of the Angels.” So too in the Paraphrase of Genesis, 105, 13: bone werigan for se weriga. Third, the compounding of adjectives with substantives whereby the adjective remains unchanged, through all cases, as in nægled cnearr, cread cnear, the Saxon Chronicle of Gibson, 938: gewitan him ða norðmen nægled cnearrum, “the Northmen fled in nailed ships,” cread cnearon flot cyning. ut gewat on fealene flod, “Sailing in welcome ships, the king escaped into the yellow sea.”
Truly, fyrene seems to be put in place of fyrenum in this which follows: him on laste beleac. lipse 7 wynna. hihtfullne ham. halig Engel. be fream hæse. fyrene sweorde, “Finally the holy angel, at the Lord’s command, barred the most pleasant place of peace and joy from them with a flaming sword.” So too ofslegene and beslægene seem to be put in place of ofslegenum and beslægenum in the following (Paraphrase of Genesis, 44): gewiton feorh heora. fram ðam folc styde. fleame nergan. secgum ofslegene, “They departed from the camp, so that they might save their lives by fleeing, the soldiers having been slain.” Freondum beslægene. from hleow stole. hettend læddon. ut mid æhtum. Abrahames mæg. of Sodoma byrig, “Growing hot, they led out the nephew of Abraham with his goods from the city of Sodom, their fellows having been slain.”
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Seventh, phrases employing ellipsis, especially in discourses where there are auxiliary verbs, occur not infrequently among poets writing in Dano-Saxon; for example, Paraphrase of Genesis, 99, 7: blæd bið æghwæm. dæm þe hælende. heran þenceð. 7 wel is ðam þe þæt mot, understand don, “The prize for all who think to obey Jesus and it is well for all who can do this.” 90, 20: sohton þa swiþe. in sefan gehydum. hwæt seo hand write. haliges gastes, understand getacnian mot, “Then in thoughts internal t they sought what that Scripture of the Holy Spirit might signify.” 42, 10: wit synt gemaægas. unc gemaæne ne sceal. (understand wesan) elles awiht. nympe eall tela. lufu langsumu, “We are two kinsmen, there will be nothing
between us except that which is best, lasting love.” The same, 23: him ða eard geceas. 7 eðel-setl. sunu Arones. on Sodoma byrig. æhte sine. beagas from Betlem. 7 botl gestreon. welan wundun gold, understand ferende, “Then the son of Haron picked out for himself lodging and a seat in the city of Sodom, bringing possessions and riches with him.”
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Eighth, the Anglo-Saxon poets sometimes use nouns compounded with an extra element, which I have discussed in chapter 20, rule 3, and chapter 21 towards the end; for example, alhn for ahl, in the Paraphrase of Genesis 71, 6; firenum for firum, at 101, 16, and we have firnum, 100, 18; deowen for deow in the fragment of the history of Judith, 22.
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Ninth, it is perhaps worth the effort to warn the reader about poetic epenthesis, by which words changed from their natural form sometimes cause difficulty for novices: thus, heold is read for hold; heorotas for heortas; gielp for gelp; gield for geld; hearra and hierra for herra; gien for gen; niede for nede; meotod for metod; strienan for strynan; giet for get; gieta for geta; siem for sem; secgeað for secgað; freom for from; spreocan for spræcan; beoran for beran; siendon for sindon; giestum for gestum; and so on. Metathesis likewise sometimes occurs, such as spryst for spyrst, and not infrequently syncope of words, as edge for eadige; edga for eadga; nergan for
nerigan; egsa for egesa; lifge for lifige. Likewise, poets writing in Dano-Saxonic sometimes, as it were, change the spelling into a broad form of pronunciation, as in æðelo for æðela; freolicu for freolice; heligu for heliga; hafus for hafes, which is itself for hafest; ðeostræ for ðeostr or ðeostru; or owpher for ægpher. But of the barbarous writing of those writing in Dano-Saxonic we have said enough in previous chapters.

XXIV.
Likewise, it should be observed that the poets of the Anglo-Saxons especially rejoice in combining synonyms—both substantives and adjectives—for the purpose of indicating that a thing is the highest and most perfect of its kind, as in the Paraphrase, 22, 2: frea drihten min, “my highest Lord!” Of this kind are mægen-craft, “greatest power, omnipotence”; feond sceada, “most hostile enemy”; wuldor torht, “most glorious, most splendid,” and countless others.

XXV.
All poets also rejoice not rarely in the substitution of number, especially that by which a plural is put in place of a singular, as in the Paraphrase, 53, 7: eodon sona. swa him Ebrisca. Eorl wisade. in-under edoras, “They went immediately inside under the roof, just as they had been instructed by the Hebrew man, or hero,” namely Abraham.
XXVI.

Moreover, it should first be observed by those who desire to read the poets of the Anglo-Saxons with pleasure, that they denote “human race,” or “men” in species, both absolutely and in composition, by nouns for the multitude, as, *leod*, *leoda*, “people, populace, mob”; *đeod, đeoda*, “race, people, nation, province”; *wered, werod*, “assembly, army, troop, band”; *driht*, “family, mass, people, throng”; *folc, folce*, “crowd, people, mass, family”; *driht-folc*, the same. To which you may add names which encompass every class of men, such as *eorlas* and *ceorlas*, “nobles and common”; *weras* and *wif*, “men and women.” Second, any number of men or any man alone may be denoted by nouns signifying the order, position, or condition of the man, as, *eorl*, “duke, count, governor”; *gesiđ*, “count, associate, imperial count, governor, noble”; *æpeling*, “noble, splendid one, renowned one”; *đegn*, “thane”; *wiga, wigend*, “duke, warrior”; *gerefa*, “viscount, prefect, tribune, councilor, public servant”; *wine*, “beloved, friend”; *gefera*, “associate, companion”; *scalc*,

163 “servant,” and so on. Yet a number of these such as *eorl, æpeling, gesiđ*, sometimes especially indicate men excelling in their state and condition.

XXVII.

\[163\] Gothic *SKALAS*. From this expression certain proper names, such as Godescalc, and so on, are derived.
To this point we have worked to explain those things which torture readers when reading poetry; lastly, they must zealously take care that they rightly distinguish metrical discourses into their sentences, and sentences into their sections, in books both printed and manuscript, paying no attention to metrical points, which do not divide discourse into its single parts, but only the poem into meter. Hence, they may occur everywhere, between a substantive and its adjective, between prepositions and the case which they rule, between a possessive noun and that which seems to be possessed by it, and finally between a nominative and the verb which it precedes, as these examples that follow show:

Paraphrase of Genesis 12, 1: 7 him bi twegin. beamas stodan, “and next to them were two trees”; 11, 19 hwearf him þurh. ða hell dora, “he returned through the gates of hell”; 15, 9 heo ða ðæs ofætes æt. alwaldan bræc. word 7 willan, “then he ate of that fruit, breaking the commandment and the will of the Almighty”; 26, 3 ðara anum wæs. Iabal noma, “the name of the second of them was Jabal.” In addition, in the same clause several metrical points almost always occur: for example, 25, 6 ic awyrged sceal. þeoden of gesyhðe. ðinre hweorfan, “I, Lord, cursed, am about to depart from your sight;” 27, 5 ða wearþ Seme. suna 7 dohra. on woruld rice. worn afeded, “then a crowd of sons and daughters was born to Shem in his earthly kingdom”; 39, 11, Ðu geblettsad scealt. on mund-byrde. minre lifigan, “you will live blessed under my protection.” Indeed, this metrical point sometimes is placed between syllables of the same word, as in the Paraphrase of Genesis ða gingran on
upp. stod ece ðrihten. God in Galileam, “Then in Galilee, the Eternal Lord God rose up among the disciples.”

XXVIII.

Above I said that readers of the poets should zealously pay attention that they distinguish metrical writings into their sentences correctly in both manuscripts and printed books, since it sometimes happens that periods or marks of final punctuation are placed where they should not be placed, or similarly are omitted where they ought to be placed. You have an example of the former in the Paraphrase of Genesis 1,6 after heold, where no final punctuation mark should be placed, but it should come after gusta weardum, line 8. On page 61, 1,2 the mark :. is placed after eard fæst, where there is no sentence ending, but it comes, after fremdum, line 3. You have an example of the latter, 58, 18, where after gestealh the mark :. is wanting, when, however, it should be placed there, and also it should be placed after bearn, 61, 10. Also after wunode, line 19 and after wundra miht, 91, 16, and in every place where the sentence is complete, even if the marks are not placed there.

Hitherto for your sake, kind reader, I have given all my effort to passing on the rules which, if you carefully direct your mind to them, will not only render the poems of the Anglo-Saxons easy for you, but pleasant and useful to read. And so that there may not be lacking to you, now fortified with the rules, something in which you may exercise your diligence and talent, it has seemed
right to add a little metrical treatise, written with regard to the Dano-Saxonic language at the end of this chapter, reading which you will be able to test the rules given by us and to find out whether they respond to our wishes and your expectation. I was driven to do this both by the beauty of the poetry and the lack of poetic books, as well as by the prayers of some learned men, who asked me again and again that this calendar, the most elegant Menologium, might not come forth in public without a Latin translation.

[Hickes here prints the Old English Menologium from MS Cotton Tiberius B.i, accompanied by a Latin translation.]

Notes on the Calendar

line 3: On midne winter, “in the middle of winter”] Namely on the 8th Kalends of January, or the 25th day of December, which was celebrated for two reasons among the northern peoples: both because it followed that preeminent night which they called moedrenecht or modrenecht, that is, “parent” of all other “nights,” from which they began their year; and because once they were converted to the faith they observed the Nativity of the Lord with much celebration on that day with the Church. Thence, “the Nativity of the Lord” among the Anglo-Saxons was known as midwynter mæsse-dæg, as the feast of Saint John the Baptist was called midsumeres mæsse-dæg. “The Feast of the Nativity of the Lord” is called also in the Saxon records, geol, geola, and in the
records of the Dano-Saxons iol, iul, and even today among the northern English and the Scots Yule, as in the rubric of the Scottish Church, which designates the psalms to be recited at the four great feasts one sees written in red letters: “Youle or Christmas Day.”

**line 6:** *On ðy eahteoðan dæg, “on the eighth day (from the Nativity) ] Or, “on the eighth day of Yule,” as if after eahtoðan, geoldæg had been written, as in the Menologium of the Cotton Library, Ms. Julius A.10, on ðone eahtðan geohheldæg bid pas monðes fruma. ðe mon nemnæd Ianuarius þæt is on ure geðeode se æfter geola. ðis is æresta geares monæd ge mid romwarum ge mid us (   )

**line 13:** *Kalendus gepincged, “the Kalends having been celebrated”]* Or, “having been observed with much celebration.” Concerning which, the poet [Ovid] writes in the first book of the *Fasti:* “An auspicious light arises; favor it with both tongues and minds,” and “Hail, joyous day always return to better.” This day was observed among ancient Christians not as “the Feast of the Circumcision of the Lord,” concerning which there is no mention here, but in feasting, songs, dances, games, mutually exchanged gifts, and auguries of a good year of that kind, all of which good bishops and priests were always striving to remove from the congregation of the faithful, as tending to the huge detriment of religion, and more to the damnation of the people, than to their salvation.

**line 17:** *folc mycel, “a great people”]* That is, as I believe, the Roman people, called mycel by the author.
line 18: *Januarius gerim*, “January of the calendar”] Thus indeed *gerim*, as *rijm* among the ancient Cimbrians, means “calendar, almanac, ephemeris.” *Rijm*, Guðmundur Andresson says in his Icelandic lexicon, neuter gender, “calendar, almanac.” Hence, as Olaus Wormius writes in *Fastis Danici*, book one, chapter two, the ancien Danes commonly called *rimstocke*, those wooden instruments on which they cut their calendars. For although in our age (he says) *rim* denotes “verses” or “poems,” for the Danish and the Icelanders many rhymes, even 20, 30, or 60 are called *rima* in the singular, with a collective noun; in the old days, however, it designated the calendar, to which the course of the year, the progression of the months and order of the days was assigned. This is witnessed for me by the very ancient parchment at the end of which I read this:

```
Att dufant ar, og dry Hundrat ara og tiu-
hu ar og ata ar varu
Liden af Gus byrd da en
Ditta Rim var skrivat.
```

“One thousand, three hundred, twenty-eight years had elapsed from the birth of Christ when this calendar was entrusted to writing.” Now the first month of the year is called, not unfittedly, “January of the calendar” according to that line of Ovid in book 1 of the *Fasti*: “for the first month belongs to Janus, because the door [*janua*] is first.”

line 19: *And ðæs embe fif niht*, “and five nights from hence”] Thus through all this little book of the calendar of the Anglo-Saxon Church, *embe feower wucan*, “four weeks having elapsed”; *ðæs embe ane niht*, “one night having passed”; and so on.
In these cases the preposition *embe* does not signify “about” or “an approximate time,” but like *vm* among the Cimbrians, time “absolutely certain,” or precisely as many days, nights, weeks, months, years, as the added number denotes. Thus in the Icelandic Bibles, “they spent the night” is rendered “þeir voru þar vm nottina.” Thus in Olaf’s Saga, chapter 117, “þridiu veitzlo hafdi han vm paska,” “he established a third feast at the time of Easter.” Thus Genesis 16,16 “sex vm aatræt,” “86.” Thus 4 Kings [2 Kings] 8, 17 “ham hafde tuo vetur vm þritust,” “He was 32 years old.” And verse 26, “Ahasia hafde tuo vm tuitugt,” “Ahasias who is of 22 years” or, “Ahasias was 22 years old.”

**line 19: fif niht**] The ancient northern races were accustomed to reckon not by years, months, and weeks not by days but by nights, as Verstegan observed before us, chapter 3 and Olaus Wormius Fasti Danici, book 1, chapter 11. Hence still today among the English the terms “sennight,” that is, “seven nights,” and “fortnight,” that is, “fourteen nights,” denote a week and the time of two weeks.

**line 20: fulwiht tiid, “baptismal feast”**] Or Feast of the Epiphany of the Lord, which was twofold: one which came about for the Magi by the Star, the second on the day of baptism, which is also called Theophania, because the most Holy Trinity appeared at that time, the Father in voice, the Son in the flesh, and the Holy Ghost as a dove. Some people add a third to these, namely the manifestation by which Christ announced himself to be God by changing water into wine. Ritualists call this manifestation of the Lord, Bethphania, because it happened in “a house,” when he was present at a marriage. Hence, because of
the threefold manifestation of Christ done on this day, among the Ancients, one always reads *day or feast of the Epiphanies*, but in this calendar mention is made only of the second, namely the epiphany on the day of baptism, as being the one whose observance was the most ancient and best known of all, according to those comments of Chrysostom, in Homily 161 Tom. 5, p. 979, where he enumerates the seven feasts of Christians. He writes about the two prior, however, thus:

"The first and foremost of all feasts is the birth of Christ in the flesh; the second feast is the apparition of Christ, our God, whereby approaching the Jordan, he showed the descent of his indescribable mercy to all men." Concerning the baptism of Christ, Chrysostom understands again epiphany, Homily 74, Tom. 5, p. 524

C.1.26 "Because he became known to all not when he had been born, but when he had been baptized; for up until that day he was unknown to many; and that
many did not recognize him, nor did they know who he was, hear John, and so

line 23: Dæne twelfta dæg hatað. “They call the twelfth day.”] That day even now is called among the English “the Twelfth Day,” assuredly by counting exclusively from the beginning of the year, or the birth of Christ; but in the Runic calendars of the old Danish Church, which Olaus Wormius presents in book three of the Fasti Danici, it is called by calculating inclusively “threttandi dahr,” that is, “the thirteenth day.” In the Saxon Chronicle of Gibson for the year 1066 it is called twelfta mæsse-dæga.

line 28: sol-monad] That is “sun month.” For among the Cimbrians sol or sola means sun, as in the text of Voluspa, verse 63: sal ser han standa. solu fegra, “He sees the palace standing more beautiful than the sun,” and in verse 4: sol stein sunnan a salar steina, “the sun was illuminating the stones of the palace from the south.” Now February was called “the month of the sun” because the sun at that time, returning perceptibly toward the summer tropic, makes the days longer, brighter, and hotter.

line 33: Februarius fær “wild February”] Fær among the Anglo-Saxons enjoys a double meaning. Its first meaning is like fær among the Cimbrians, signifying “strong, wild, violent”; secondly it means “empty, void, hollow,” from far of the Cimbrians, “little, small,” and in either sense it [February] may be called fær, not inappropriately. In the first sense, not unlike September below, it is called fær because it is a windy, rainy, and generally stormy month; in the second as well,
which is especially characteristic, it can rightly be called fær because it is a month as it were empty and deficient, having fewer days than all the rest of the months of the year, whether full or hollow, especially of the year which is not a leap year.

**line 37:** Marian mæssan, “The Feast of Mary”] That is, the Feast of the Purification of Mary, which we call Candlesmas, and which the calendars of the old Danish Church cited above calls Kindelness.

**line 45:** “Winter, terrified, flees.”] That is, “spring begins.” From the ninth of February moreover, or the fifth of the Ides, the calendar of the Romans calculates the beginning of spring, according to the lines of Ovid, Fasti, book 2, “The fifth day brought forth shining radiance from the watery waves, and it will be the beginning of spring.”

**line 71:** hlyda healic, hlyda “distinguished”] The month of March is called among the Anglo-Saxons hlyd-monæþ, from the verb hlydan, Cimbric at hlíoda, “to resound, to shout, to make a commotion,” because the month is stormy and cloudy.

**line 205:** æræ līða, “former Litha”] June among the Anglo-Saxons is called ærra līða or līda, and July æflæra līða, “second litha” or “lida.” Moreover, those two months were so called, either from the Saxon līð, “mild, gentle,” from which līdan, “to warm, to soothe;” or from līdan, “to pass over, to navigate”; truly because in those two months the calmness of the air is gentle and mild, and the seas are accustomed to be sailed. he ofer sæ lað in Gallia rice, “he sailed to Gaul.”

line 222: *Deodnes dyrling,* “beloved of the Lord”] The poet here seems to confuse John the Apostle with John the Baptist.

line 265: *Weod-monað*] Thus August was called by the Anglo-Saxons. But among the old Angles *weiden-monað*, *weiden-monath*, because, as Bede wrote in *On the Reckoning of Time*, chapter 13, tares, or bad weeds may abound especially in this month.

line 268: *hlaf-mæssen dæg,* “feast of first-fruits”] In the calendar of the English before the reform of religion *Lammas Day*.

line 284: *Fægerust mæg þa. wifa wuldor,* “most beautiful of virgins, glory of women.”] Now above the blessed virgin is called by the poet only *cyninges modor*, “mother of the Lord,” and below *cwena selost*, “best of women.” Indeed concerning the Virgin Mary the Anglo-Saxon Church was accustomed to feel and speak so temperately that not even poets would write about her beyond what was appropriate. So too, that poet, whoever he was, who related the deeds of the Savior in the Cottonian harmony of the Gospels, has written nothing concerning the Virgin, mother of the Lord, not sound and modest, even when he might seem to be carried away in her praise, as if by a poetic frenzy. Most often he simply calls her “virgin, female, woman, Mary”: as *thuo sprac im thiu magat angegin*, “then the Virgin answered.” *thuo habbda est is uuord garo Engil thes aluualden theri idesi tegegnes,* “then the angel of the Almighty answered the woman.” *thiu thiorna all forstuod uuises mannes uuord,* “the Virgin well understood every word of the wise one.” *Maria all beheld,* “Mary hid everything away,” and so on. Rising
higher, he calls her “solitary virgin; chaste woman; sacred virgin; good woman; good virgin; blessed virgin; virgin of God; mother of the Almighty; most beautiful of women of men, of virgins”: for example, munelica Magat thar Maria uuass mid iro sunie salig thiorna mahtiges moder, “there was Mary the solitary virgin, blessed virgin, mother of the Almighty, with her son.” Idese sconiost ellero uuiuo uulitigost, “most beautiful of females, most fair of all women.” Ni uuis thu quat hie mannum ureth theornum thinero siu is githungan uuib, “do not, he said, get angry with your virgin, for she is a pure woman.” Theru helagum thiernun Marium thero guodun, “of that sacred and good virgin Mary.” biuuand ina mid uuadi uuibo scoinosta fagoron fratohon, “most beautiful of females, she covered him with a robe with beautiful ornaments.” Fagar heleg thiorno thiu magat, “young, beautiful virgin.” mid thero godes thiornun, “with the virgin of God.” Idis thero guodun, “of the good woman.” thuo ni uuas lang te thiu that it san antfunda firio sconiosta cristes muoder, “then not a long time had passed, before the mother of Christ the most beautiful of humans, found it.” At the height of his frenzy, he calls her merely, “immaculate woman, and holy bride of the Heavenly King”: for example, gruotta hie thuo Iohannes ant hiet that hie iru fulgensi; uuell minniodi sia so milda so man is muoder scal idis unuuemma, “then gentle John addresses her, promising that he would love the spotless woman as perfectly as anyone ought to love his own mother.” Giuuitun im thuo eft an Galileo land Ioseph endi Maria helag hiuuiski hebran cyninges, “then into the land of Galilee returned Joseph and Mary, the Bride of the Heavenly King.” These things the poet, taken beyond himself, wrote a little
more loftily than was suitable; which things however can be understood in a
sound and temperate sense; which is utterly rejected in the blasphemies not only
of Anselm and Bernard, and other writers of the Roman Church, but also of the
sacred offices of the blessed Virgin of the Roman Church itself, which, having
been compiled in a book written in English whose title is The Mirror of the Blessed
Virgin, it grieves me to repeat here.

line 315: halig monað] That is, “month of holy things.”

line 355: winter fylded] Thus October was called by the ancient English, because in
this month the winter conditions were beginning. “The month in which the
winter conditions began, (said Bede) they called Winterfylleth, a new name
having been made up from winter and full moon, because winter takes its
beginning from the full moon of this month.”

line 362: And fif nihtum] Thus the manuscript, but the word ðreo seems to be
missing. For the feast day of Saints Simon and Jude in all the old martyrologies is
designated as 5 Kalends November, or the 25th day of October. Therefore, we
think one should read ðreo 7 fif nihtum.

line 376: Blotmonað] November is called Blotmonað, from the Gothic ęrtan,. Cimbric ąt bima, at blot, Saxon blotan, “to sacrifice offerings, to sacrifice in
blood;” however all from ęrph, bima, blod, “blood.” “Blothmonath month of
sacrifices,’ (says Bede in On the Reckoning of Time, chapter 13) “because in it they
dedicated to their gods the cattle which they were going to slaughter.”

160
For January was called æftera iula, “second Yule,” as the poet writing Dano-Saxonic wrote the word. From Cimbric iol or iul, about which Gudmundus Andrææ comments in his entry on the word. From where the word iol took its origin it is not possible to be sharp-sighted in so great a darkness of antiquity. However, in Anglo-Saxon it is written geola and the months are called ærra geola and æftera geola, and Somner believes them called thus because the one precedes and the other follows closely “the birth of the Lord,” which is called geol among the Anglo-Saxons. Rightly indeed, because it pleased Christians to assign the term iol or geol, the ancient name of the rites and festivity of pagans, to “the Birth of the Lord,” just as they transferred the ancient name easter or eostro or eostur, to designate the paschal feast. Truly, as April is called Eosturmonað, as Bede bears witness164, from the goddess Eostre, whose feast the ancient northern races celebrated before the name of the pagan feast was transferred to signify the Christian; so December was called the first and January was called the second geol or iula from the Yule rites and feasts among those people before (having converted to the faith) they transferred the name geol, geola, giul, iol, iola to designate the feast of the Nativity. But for what reason the Saturnalia or mid-winter rites of the northern races, is not agreed upon among the learned. Some people, whose opinion Loccenius rejects in book one, chapter

164 See the book of the Venerable Bede, which he wrote on the reckoning of time, chapter 13, “Eosturmonath, which now means Easter Month, formerly took its name from the goddess of those people, who was called Eostre, and for whom they celebrated feasts in that month: from whose name they now name the Easter season, calling the joys of the new observance by the name of the ancient rite.”
five of the *Antiquitates Sveo-gothicae*, think these Yule feasts were first established in honor of Julius Caesar. George Buchanan thinks the Britons called the Saturnalia of the Romans *Julia*, substituting the name of Caesar for Saturn. Others wish the word Yule to be derived from the Greek *iilos*, which signifies the hymn that the Fates were accustomed to sing to Mercury, as is evident from this verse:

Δευτερίδες πούχουσε καλές ήεδεν ιούλους.

“And preparing salted grain, she was singing the known *iulos.*” Didymus says the hymn to have been in praise of Ceres, which Athanaeus in book 14 likewise notes from Semus Delius; and Theodoretus, points this out in the *Book of Matter and the World*, speaking thus “Let us not sing the *Julus* for Ceres at Yule, nor the Dythramb for Bacchus.” This indeed agrees with our understanding very well, and with those Yule games of our ancestors who either celebrated after the barn had already been filled with grain, or because the new year and the season was on hand to be made and worked for Ceres once more. But you will say, from whence could an expression that is exotic and Greek and so outdated have become known or familiar to northern people? I answer, other and more remote expressions have been drawn from the Greeks, which the Danes make use of today. What? Is not our *fod*, that is “born,” from the Greek *phuo*, “to be born”? Is not *kerling*, “elderly woman,” from *cheras*? *Sinnep, sanapi* from *sloepe*? And *smor* “butter,” than which we use nothing more frequently, is from *muron*, and with *s* added, *smuron*, “ointment?” Just as the Attics say *smikon* for *mikron*. This opinion of Pontanus, Wormius cites from letters Stephen Stephanin sent to him in his
Fasti Danici, book one, chapter seven. But it was rejected by the most learned Olaus Wormius in his notes to chapter four of Hervarar Saga on the words iola apton, where he says: “Most correctly these things are asserted by Pontanus, except that the word iul is of somewhat broader meaning than that it solely denotes a hymn of Ceres.” For indeed, iol is celebrated in honor and in praise of Ceres, who for our ancestors was Frigga or Fre, as our author makes clear in chapter 14, and in Olaf’s Saga, chapter 107; but not with song and hymn alone, but also with games, with drinking parties and with all signs of festive joy, but with all good prognostications. Thence, iola, “to indulge the spirit,” and iæla and iala “to converse.”

Moreover, to theses things of Verelius it is possible to add for the purpose of rebutting the opinion of Pontanus, that this Cimbric iul, was written giuli by the Angles, before the time of Bede, and in Anglo-Saxon geol, geola, gehol, gehul, geohol, which have little or no relationship with the Greek iolos. On the contrary, Cimbric iul or iol seems to be derived from the Anglo-Saxon geol, gehul; with ge-converted to i- , as in isur, in Saxon gesur “very harsh”; igrænn, in Saxon gegrene, “very green”; and thus in the Dano-Saxon dialect the prefix ge- softens into i- : as in iula or iul from gehul or geul or geola, emphatically geul, geola. Wherefore in order to duly investigate the origin of the Cimbric iul or iula, the origin of the Anglo-Saxon geol or geul is first to be sought out which we shall proceed soon to discuss.
Gudmundus Andreae, likewise foreign to Anglo-Saxon matters, who seeks to derive all his points from a Hebrew source, considers iol, neuter genitive plural, in a twofold sense: in its more recent sense it means the same as iola dagr, iola hattijd, that is, the feast of Christ’s Nativity; or it means “winter rites,” celebrated long before Christ’s birth, among the Gentiles, more correctly among the race of Giants which they say arose from Canaanite fugitives. In the former sense he says the word is not ineptly to be related to Iol, or Hebrew יִול, “little one, little boy,” namely when “new offspring is sent down from high heaven.” In the latter sense, he writes thus about the word: “What therefore is left over, except that these (namely the giants sprung from the Canaanites) took the example and the etymology of the thing for themselves from the jubilee of the Hebrews.” For the jubilee feast is so called from יובל, that is, “production and intensification of the din of the trumpets” which are ram’s horns. But these things are so incorrect, that they do not require refutation.

Olaus Wormius in the Fasti Danici, book one, chapter 14, no less incorrectly thinks iul to be derived from the Danish huile, “rest.” The months giuli (he says) take their names from the turning of the sun to the increase of the day, because one of them precedes it and the other follows close after. He cites these things in their entirety as the words of Bede. Then he applies to the words his conjecture, in the following words: “From the winter solstice, if I am not mistaken, because the sun then seems as if it rests before it proceeds closer to the
equator, *huile* even now denotes ‘rest’ among us; *at huile* ‘to rest,’ but the change
from *h* into *g* is easy; since in alphabetical order they are neighbors, and very
frequently the hand of the typesetter, hurrying along, may make a change of
such things, even in other cases. And therefore, if with Scaliger you read *giuli,*
you will derive it not inappropriately from the feast, which was celebrated at that
time among our people, and is called *iuel* even now.” This most learned man,
ignorant of the Anglo-Saxon language in which Danish *iul,* formerly called *iol,* is
written *geol,* and so on, as is made clear above, wishes *huile* to be read in place of
*giuli,* against every analogy. Moreover, Bede writes that those two months,
namely December and January, were called *giuli* by the ancient Angles, not from
the perceived “rest” of the sun in the winter solstice but from its “turning” to the
increasing of the day; plainly alluding to the Anglo-Saxon *hweol,* *hwel,* or *ge-
hweol,* *gehwel*; Icelandic *hiol* and *huel,* “wheel.” For this reason, all that the great
man writes about the easy exchange of *h* and *g* and about the error of the
typesetter is in vain. It displeases no less that he says that *giuli* ___ *giul* in the
plural, if it so to be read with Scaliger, is to be derived from Cimbric *iul.* For I
have shown above from the analogy of other examples that *iul* is rather to be
derived from *giul.*

Therefore, let us now examine from where *giul* of the old Angles, who
came with the Jutes and the Saxons into England, and Saxon *geol,* emphatically
*geola,* should be derived. Bede, as the words of his above bear witness, believes
giul and geol to be derived from hweol, hwel, and with an increase in syllables, gehweol, gehwel, Cimbrian hiol and huel. The author of the Menologium written in in Anglo-Saxon prose in MS. Cotton Tiberius B.1 seems to be of the same opinion; his words are: on þam twelftan monðe byð an 7 xxx daga. se monað is nemned on Leden Decembris, 7 on ure geðeode se ærra geola, oðer se æftera. Forþan ðe hyra oðer ganged beforan ðæra sunnan. ærþon þe heo cyrre hig to ðæs dæges lenge. oðer æfter, “In the twelfth month are 31 days. This month is called in Latin December, but in our language first geola, because there are two months which rejoice in one name; the one is ‘former’ geola the other is the ‘latter.’” For one of these precedes the sun before it turns itself to the lengthening of the day, the other follows close after. It confirms this opinion of Bede concerning the derivation of the term giul from hwel or gehwel, hweol or gehweol, that in Saxon is is written with an h, gehul and gehol, as in the Laws of Alfred, chapter 39. The twelve days in the feast of the Nativity of the Lord are called XII dagas on gehol. This opinion is also corroborated by what Loccenius observes in book one, chapter five of the Antiquitates Sveo-gothcae, namely that on the Norwegian Runic rod at the feast of the birth of Christ, a wheel is depicted. Verelius, for whom the opinion of Bede is not satisfactory, in the notes to chapter four of Hervarar Saga, does not deny that the Scandinavians designated each solstice by a wheel, as in some calendar (he says) I have seen a wheel incised at the summer solstice; but in like manner I deny that on account of this they derive the term iul, which they used in ancient times, and which we use now with the same meaning, from the turning of the
sun around the equinox. The other turning around the summer solstice ought to have been called *Iul*.

Verelius therefore, thinking that the origin and the significance of the word should be sought elsewhere, contends with many testimonies that *iul* and *iol* marked a time of revelry and festive joy in ancient times, and since those revels were instituted once with the winter sacrifices had been performed and were especially public and solemn, therefore they were called, *iol, iolabod, iolweitzla* on account of eminence. He first supports his opinion from *Olaf’s Saga*, chapter 117: “Sigurd was accustomed to perform the three sacrifices each winter (year), one at the beginning of winter, the second at midwinter, and the third at the beginning of summer. But after Siguard became a Christian he retained his usual custom as regards the feasts: so that in the autumn, he invited his friends to him, but in the middle of the winter he celebrated the Yule feasts, inviting very many; but the third feast he established at Easter and it too was sufficiently well attended.” Not a few things (he says) may be observed here; that all the year was designated indeed by the name of winter, then that three sacrifices were completed each year, and that public feasts were established at each sacrifice; likewise the one which happened in the middle of winter was far more sacred than the others and was called *iolabod*, that is, “banquet invitation.”

Then, from *Olaf’s Saga*, chapter 108, he cites the response of Alverus to King Olaf the Fat, who with indignation had heard that the people of Trondheim
had instituted *midvetarblot* and *blotveitzlor*. He denied that the peasants were guilty of that crime. “We celebrated” (he says) “festive delights, and lively *iolensia*, and drinking parties widely through the territory. For the peasants do not prepare their Yule feasts so sparingly that great leftovers do not remain for continuing the drinking. Here in More there is a great multitude of citizens and large buildings, and a populous gathering of neighbors all around, all of which make for increasing the joy, so that many may indulge together in drinking parties.” “From these things,” (says Verelius) “it is now clear that *iol*, *iolabod*, and *iolaveitzla* were celebrations at the winter rites, which were called *midvetrar blot* and *hafud blot*.“ He then adds, “The Angles, and likewise the Scandinavians, called those months [December and January] former and later *giuli* from *iol*, the festival of the sacred banquets; not in truth from the turning of the sun, or wheel, *Giuli* ahead and following after. Finally,” said the most learned man and greatest investigator of the Northern antiquities, “they expressed this whole time of Yule joys on the Runic calendar with a horn, raised and filled with wheat liquor.” He also cites many other things leading hither, as this from *Olaf’s Saga*, chapter 144: “The Yule feast and the party had been prepared from the gathered contributions, and a numerous crowd of country people were drinking together on that estate throughout the Yule festival.” “Half of Yule having been completed, Thorrerus set out with all the nobles to his relative, so that he might spend what was left of Yule drinking together there.”
These things Verelius says to prove that this *iol*, whatever kind of a word it is, indicates “carousing, drinking parties, feasts, banquets,” accustomed to be held in the winter rites. But I am surprised that the very great man for all his acumen did not see the origin of the word in *øl*, “beer” and metonymically “feast, drinking party.” In his own *Lexicon Scandicum*, *øl*, he says is specifically “beer,” but often it is taken for “feast.” Thence, *olgiora* “to prepare a banquet”; *olstenna*, “summons to the feast”; *olbodiu*, “invited to a feast”; and above *samburdar aul*, that is *øl*, “a drinking party, banquet, from contributions.” Indeed, those emblematic “horns” full of “cereal liquor” with which the Yule festival was portrayed in the Runic calendar, as it were, plainly proclaim that *iol* is to be derived from *øl*. Rather, Gudmundus Andrae seemed to himself to see something of *øl*, in his *iol*: “this feast however, (he says), comes from *øl*, beer, just as he enjoined the Bacchanalia to be begun with the same.” But perhaps you will say here, what obstructed the sight of Verelius so much that he could not discern *iol* to be derived from *øl*? I respond, the prefix *I*, which is a syllabic increase, intensifying the meanings of the words to which it is prefixed, and rendering them emphatic. Hear what Gudmundus Andrae says in his notes to the second stanza of the *Voluspa*: “*Ivide*, but *I* is prefixed, which is an intensifying particle, as in the words *igillde*, ‘intense price’; *isurt*, ‘extremely bitter’; *igrænn*, ‘very green.’” But to the intensifying particles *I* among the Cimbrians and Scandinavian people, corresponds *ge* in Anglo-Saxon, concerning which we said above, chapter nine rule 17, that it increases, intensifies, and amplifies the meaning of the word to
which it is prefixed, and it renders it more perfect and emphatic. Thence, comes about that *i-øl* in Cimbric, written in Anglo-Saxon *geol*, and in the Dano-Saxonic *iul*, with the *o* having been easily mutated into *u*, with the help of the intensifying prefix *i* and *ge*, make *øl*, *ol* “carousing, drinking party, feast, banquet,” emphatically, and designate “carousing and those and convivial rituals” which were closely connected to the winter rites, as the chief ones of all, and the most public. But again, perhaps, objecting, you will ask, if things are so, why Bede thought *giul* of the old Angles to be derived from elsewhere; namely from *hwel*, *gehwel*, or *hiol?* I answer: Bede, writing in *The Reckoning of Time* as a mathematician, preferred the astronomical designation, which might indicate the retrograde motion of the sun, or of its turning towards the increase of the day, to the grammatical one. For Bede flourished around the year 700, when the solstice fell upon the 17th day of December, and on the 25th day of the same month, when they were celebrating Yule, the sun had already turned to the increase of day by a course of five days, moving from the winter tropic toward the summer. Thus far, concerning the rites called *iol*, *iul*, *geol*, *giul*, from which the twelfth and first months of the Julian year were called, first and second *geola* or *iola*. The twelfth was so called because on its 25th day, namely the 8th Kalends of January, which the ancients believed coincide with the winter solstice, and made the head of the year, first *iol* or the feasts of Yule began to celebrated with its sacred rights. However, these festivities were accustomed to be continued through many days, as Verelius believed, up until the 13th day of January, and then to be renewed
and repeated with its sacrifices around the end of January and the beginning of February, whereby January was called geola or iola among the Anglo-Saxons.

Above, I said that the ancient dwellers of the Northern regions believed that the Solstice, or midwinter, fell on the 25th day of December, or the 8th Kalends of January. For these rituals were celebrated among the pagans long before Christ was born; indeed, perhaps they began to be celebrated first when the Solstice fell on the 25th day of December, about the year of the founding of the world 3558, that is, 390 years before Christ was born.

Indeed Gudmundus Andrae believes this heathen ritual was celebrated first not on the 25th day of December, but in January, as the months are now, during the advance of the sun into Aquarius, namely at the beginning of the month Thorri, since the winter solstice fell at that time; which overcomes faith, because the winter solstice fell at the beginning of January, or Thorri, or Thoræ, around the year of the founding of the world 2610, that is in the year 1338 before Christ was born. But however this matter may be, it is certain that many centuries ago January also had its own iol, from which that month was named.

Line 443: Nu gefindan magon. haligra tiid. þe man healdan sceal. swa bebugugeð gebod. geond Brytenrica. Saxna Cyninges, “now however, we are able to find the feasts of the saints, just as the power of the king of the Saxons orders them to be observed throughout Britain.”] These words make clear first that this Menologium of ours was common, or “pan-Anglian,” in which the names of the particular saints and
martyrs, whom they call “local,” had not yet been included in the calendar of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Second, they make clear that the Menologium of the Anglo-Saxon Church was its own, because it did not amplify its calendar with external and foreign saints. Therefore, the names of many saints are sought for in it in vain, which are now brought together in the other Cottonian Menologium, which is cited below in the second set of notes. Third, from these words, it seems to be established no less that this is the true and unquestionable calendar of the Anglo-Saxon Church, merely converted from prose into verse, which was drawn up by no private individual at will, but by the order of the King, whoever he was, and as is fair to believe from the custom of the Anglo-Saxon people, not by the sole authority of the king, but also with the agreeing of the senate, which was accustomed to be called *mycel gemot* or *witena gemot*, without which it was not the custom for kings to decide anything which concerned the kingdom and the church alike, especially in times of peace. Fourth, this passage shows the Menologium to have been written after all Anglo-Brittania had been subjected to one monarch, the sub-kings having been destroyed. Finally, it is to be observed that when this Menologium was created by the king and his wise men, the calendar of the Church demanded no huge volume, but as the superstitious emulation of the churches concerning the commeration of the saints increased with time, the number of the saints also increased to such an extent, that not only almost every single day was noted with a rubric, but one and the same day was consecrated to the memory of two, or more saints or martyrs. Again, it ought to
be observed, how little difference there is between the calendars of the Anglo-Saxon Church and of the reformed Anglican Church. Almost the same saints are in both and the number of feasts is not very different. Thus also with God ruling the thoughts and actions of men, without their knowledge, our Reformers prescribed the same things of the most Holy Eucharist, as that Easter homily of the Anglo-Saxon Church, which has been edited four times by us.

Line 483: *hafuc sceal on glofe gewunian,* “the hawk will dwell on the cliff or on the rock.”] Or in the fissures of cliffs or rocks. For among the Cimbrians, *klif,* n.g. in gen. *klifs,* is “rock, cliff, and a difficult trail on a rocky cliff.” But “rock” is called *klif* from *klif* “I cleave,” which becomes in the preterite, *klauf,* thence the words *klofe,* “cleft,” or by synecdoche “cliff of the mountain”; *klauf,* “split hoof, forked fissure”; *hliufr,* commonly *gliufr,* with *h* changed into *g,* “openings and fissures of mountains and rocks,” through which rivers rush; *klof,* “cleavage of the thighs”; finally, Anglo-Saxon *glof,* “glove,” so called from the cleavage of the fingers. But whether *glofe* in this place designates “slopes and cliffs” in which hawks rest, build nests, and rear their young, or the “glove” of the falconer, or finally something else which is unknown to me, let the judgement be in the hands of the reader.

To this point the things which it has seemed proper to note in the calendar of the Church of the Anglo-Saxons, written in Dano-Saxon during the reign of some monarch. But now it is pleasing to conclude all with the table in which the Northern names of the months of the Julian year or the solar months, are placed
But as for the names which Charlemagne gave to the months, Francis Junius, F.F., wrote some of them a little differently in his manuscript Francic glossary,
which is in the Bodleian Library; thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
<th>Londonveluudermanothe</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>Hornung, vel hormanc vel orming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Lentzmonet vel lentzinnmanoth</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Oftermenet vel oeffarnanoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Uuùnemoneet vel uuinnemanoth</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Brachmonet vel brahmanoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Heumonet vel heuin-manot t vair-M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Armnemonet vel aranmanoth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Herfismonet vel uuinntumanoth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Uueinmonet vel uuinrdumanoth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Uuindmonet vel herfismanoth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Heiligmoneth vel heilagmanoth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is pleasing to add to the Northern names of the solar months the names of the lunar also, which they had among the ancient English peoples, as Bede relates.

The intercaluary year exhibits these thirteen names of the lunar months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Februar.</td>
<td>Solmonath, Embolismus,</td>
<td>III. Lida.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This lunar year, when there was an embolism, was called *Trilidi*, from the three Lithas, and in the same, this is to be observed, that lunar months do not accord with solar. For the first falls in January and February, the last in December and January, and so with the others, each of which takes part from one solar month and part from another, unless the embolism occurs, which is wholly contained in one solar month. I thought this should be noted, so that scholars may see whether the conflicting pronouncements of ancient authors about the time of the sacred winter rites, called *midvetrar blot*, and of the Yule festivities, which exercised the talents of so many learned men, may be able to reconciled by the examination of this one thing, namely that the beginnings of the months were mobile.
Among the lunar months, however, March is called *Rehdmonath*, from their goddess Rheda, to whom in that month they sacrificed, and May *Trimilchi*, because in it, the cattle were milked three times a day. Thus says Bede. I, in truth, think with our writer of the Menologium that March was rather named *Rehdmonath* from the Saxon *reðe*, “fierce, severe”: δὲννε cymeð hrime gehyrsted.

Hear the names of the other months, in so far as I have been able to track down, thus explained in a few words. Among the Caroline names, January is called *Uuintermanoth*, from winter, which then is especially harsh. February, *Hornung*, etc., that is, “grieving, weeping, crying,” for the rains for which February is notable are the “tears” of Heaven. March, *Lentzinmanoth*, that is, the month of spring. April, *Ostarmanoth*, that is, the month of Easter. May, *Uuûnne manot*, or *Uuinne manoth*, that is, the month of joy. June, *Brachmanoth*, about which Kilianus says this: “Braeck-mænd, June, the month in which fields are dug up again, and arable land and vineyards are broken with plows and with hoes here and there.” July, *Heuu-manot*, that is, the month of hay. August, *Aran-manoth*, the month of ears of corn. September, *Herbstmanoth*, the month of autumn or harvest, and *Uuïntumanoth*. October, *Uuïndumemanoth*, the month of the grape harvest; and *Uuïnmonat*, the month of wine. November, *Uuïndtmonat*, the windy month, and *Herbisti-manoth*. December, *Heilig-manoth*, holy month, namely from the birth of Jesus Christ, and from the feasts which immediately follow. Among the Icelandic names, January is called *Midsvetrarmanudr*, that is, the month in the middle of winter; February,
Fostengangsmunudr, as I conjecture from the procession at the beginning of the Lenten fast, or day of ashes; March, Jaffndegramanudr, month of the equinox; April, Sumurmanudr, because from it the Icelanders compute the summer half of the year; May, Fardagamanudr, month of clear days, or month of days suitable for travel, or perhaps from fær, Danish faar, “sheep,” because the sheep begin to bear at that time in Iceland; June, Nottleysamanudr, month without nights; July, Madkamanudr, month of worms, because it is accustomed to produce vast numbers of worms and insects; August, Heyannamanudr, month of hay; September, Addraatamanudr; October, Slatrunarmanudr, month of slaughter, as being the month in which they slaughter cattle; November, Rydtrydarmanudr; December, Skam-deigesmanudr, that is, month of short days.

The Danes called January Jismanet, month of ice, and Glugmanet, month of windows or openings, which are accustomed to be closed at this time. February, Blidemanet, pleasant month, and Goie or Goe, about which Gudmundus Andreae says this: “Goe, f.g. Name of the month in which the sun traverses through Pisces; it is so called from the daughter of Thorus, the ancient King of Finland.” March, Thormanet, of which thus Arngrimus Ionus Islandus, in the Crymogææ, book one, chapter four says this: “From Thorre (whom they called Thorro) King of the Gotland, Finland, Kuenland, etc., the month of the Norse and now the Icelanders has the name Thorre.” And Gudmundus Andreae: “Thorre, the particular name of the former king of Quenland, from whom the month still takes its name when the sun traverses through Aquarius. However, the following month of Goe [takes
its name] from his daughter. But among the Danes, Goe comes first.” April they call Faremanet, from at fara, now at fare, Saxonic faran to depart; because that month is suitable for journeys. May on the other hand they call May-manet, not from the Danish verb at Maye as Olaus Wormius believes, but from May of the Latins, from which the verb at Maye, “to decorate with fronds and flowers,” is to be derived. For thus the blackthorn flowers, which are accustomed to sprout in England at the beginning of May, the English call May, and “to go a Maying” is to go out on the Kalends of May to gather and collect flowers and fronds, and to cut budding boughs. June they call Skersommer, that is, clear and serene summer. And July Ornemane, that is, month of serpents or worms, which then are accustomed to come out as if revived and to attack the other animals. August they call Hostmanet, the month of autumn. And September, Fiskmanet, as it were the month suitable for fish. October, Sædemanet, because they are accustomed then to plant the seeds of fruits, and Rijdmanet. November is called Slagtemanet, because then they are accustomed to slaughter the cattle, and Wintermanet from the beginning of winter. December they call Christmanet from the birth of Christ.

Among the Swedes, January is called Thora, and February Goia, from Thorre and his daughter. March is named Blida, perhaps because among them the month is gentle. April, Varant, just as among the Danes it is called Fare-manet, namely because the month is suitable for travels. Maii is from May. June Hovilt. July Hoant. August is called Skortant, that is, fading, or shortening, because the days are felt to fade and to be shortened. September, Hostmonat, the month of

Finally, so that I may apply the last hand to this chapter on the poetic art of the Anglo-Saxons, in place of a colophon, it is pleasing to add certain principles and observations about ancient Danish poetry from Olaus Wormius’s appendix of Runic Letters, because they are either fully appropriate to the poetry of the Anglo-Saxons, or they are not exactly foreign to it.

Of the old meters there are almost boundless modes […] nor is that mode counted among them with which our poets now play, placing all their skill in rhyme.

This type of meter is not tied to certain numbers of verses, but the abundance of material lays down the number, to such a degree that sometimes a single verse may be sufficient.

In these, both rhetorical and poetic art is observed. The poetic consists of quantity and harmony.

This harmony in letters consists in any couplet having three initial letters of three words entirely similar.

They called these letters with the specific name *sonorous letters*, or “sonorous letters,” because a great part of the sweetness of the sound may depend on them. But in order that the use of these may become legitimate, these rules must be heeded.
1. Sonorous consonants are obliged to be entirely the same both in the first and the second line.

2. There are two of those in the first, one in the line after, or vice versa, one in the first and two in the following, never all three together in the same line. Hence the lines \[ *\text{snidhending}, \] called hending are divided into \[ *\text{hending}, \text{snidhending}, \text{or partly comprehensive; and} \text{a total comprehension. But the first line in the couplet is called} \]

\[ *\text{allhending}, \text{snidhending}, \text{because it contains merely part of the artifice; following} \text{a total} \text{comprehension.} \]

3. All vowels give the same harmony. If one of them is placed twice in the first and once in the second, the harmony is imperfect, or if you place in the first the line \( A, E, \) and in the

---

*Concerning which Olaus Verelius writes this about the word: “Hending in the Edda is harmony, when one rhythm embraces the other and for a varying placement of rhythm in Skaldic poetry it obtains different names. For example, Adalhending, or Alhending, ‘full harmony,’ and it is placed in the second line. Snid-hending, ‘half-full harmony,’ and it is always the first line of each couplet; hence the diverse figures and names of poetry. Allhent, detthent, dunhent, frumhent, hluthent, lidhent, oddhent, ridhent, samhent, skialfent, skothent, snidhent, stamhent, vidhent, Brihent. These names are of heroic poetry, but for the varying placement of rhythm in whatever section, see the Edda, hliods grein.” Thus Verelius. You have examples of hending or of couplets having alliterative letters in whichever verse of the Voluspa, such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meire og minne</th>
<th>Gab Ginunta</th>
<th>Sol skien sunnan</th>
<th>Gött oc vidun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

All the verses of the Satyre-writer are of this kind, if his versed written in distichs, as the structure demands, such as:

I hope me into brubs, Wont wide in this world, In setting and lowing, As I a thir was, Wonders to hear. Suonken full yard.

Also, many other poems of this kind are found here and in the poetic books of the Anglo-Saxons, for example: sceop da sceyred. ham 7 heahsetl. helle heafas. Geond folen fyr.

Scippend ure. Heofens rices. hearde niðas. And fær cyle.
second *I*, it makes no difference, nor is the harmony

disturbed, because all vowels are of the same value in

harmony.

This rule of Wormius is also valid for diphthongs, which render the same

harmony with one another, and with other vowels. And in the same way that,

which escaped our observation in the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, shows itself

also in the Skalds: as in these lines of the paraphrase of Genesis:

\[
\begin{align*}
Ac \text{ he bið a rice.} & \quad Ac \text{ liggað me ymbe} & \quad Adam \text{ and Eve.} & \quad Ac \text{ ic can.} \\
Ofer \text{ heofon.} & \quad Iren \text{ benda.} & \quad On \text{ eorprice.} & \quad Eall \text{ swa geare.} \\
Ide \text{ and unnyt.} & \quad Him \text{ ða Adam.} & \quad Oððæt \text{ he Adam.} & \quad Engla \text{ gebyrdo.} \\
On \text{ ðone eagum wlat.} & \quad Est \text{ answarde.} & \quad On \text{ eorðrice.} & \quad Oð \pm\text{ þæt Adam.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The harmony in these syllables is that by which in any line, apart from the

harmony of letters, two syllables of the same sound are placed.

However, the harmony of these syllables is either exact or partial. It is

reckoned exact when harmonious syllables agree in the same vowels, and

consonant sounds, as in that of Cicero, “Non instituti, sed imbuti.” It is called

partial when there is a likeness in consonants but a difference in vowels: as in

that same author, “Non docti, sed facti,” where *o* and *a* engender discrepancy,

and they create a semi-concord. Here these rules come to be observed. In the first

line of the couplet, partial harmony suffices, but in the second line there always

should be exact harmony.

The words, in which harmony consists, should not immediately follow

one another.
Oratorical artifice to be observed in meters, concerns both the things themselves and the words.

Words are select, emphatic, modified with varied tropes and allegories.

In these they yield neither to the Greeks nor the Latins; for metaphor, synecdoche, and metonymy are very frequent for them; they have their own myths written down in the *Edda*, to which allusions are very frequent.

From the discussion of great Olaus about the ancient poetry of the Danes, or the Icelandic.

Nor in our poetry are fewer rules, freedoms, tropes, and figures used, than in the metrical art used among the chief of the Latin poets. So many beautiful transpositions are discovered in the refrains of the ancients (which they aspired to eagerly), that they frequently enclosed two or more matters answering to one another in a single meter. In them are noticed so many enigmatic words and metaphorical games that even for the leaders of metricists themselves, it is almost a Gordian knot, and readers indeed understanding the words might understand little or nothing of the matter.

For even though the Eddic formulas, the many names of things somehow sought from far away, might be able to be described in a certain way, and named in Latin; still, the brilliance of the words, the grand elegance, and the genuine quality, as it resounds in our language, can by no means be presented and revealed. The waters are drunk more sweetly here from the actual source.
How much these things agree with those which we have related above, the reader will easily notice. But there is one observation of Wormius, which our observation on the quantity of syllables plainly attacks: “Here,” he says, “the quantity of syllables is not heeded as among the Latins.” Whether or not this rule is true, it is not permissible for us, not much versed in Skaldic poetry, to judge. It perhaps holds true in those cases where the order of the words, as in those which Wormius quotes, comes near the common order of speech. But in the Skaldic, where the arrangement of words is topsy-turvy and dislocated, and is very distant not only from the order of those speaking simply but also of those speaking ornately, as always in the Anglo-Saxon poets, it is very likely that this rule of Wormius fails. Indeed, no rule can be given why words should be transposed in poems by so complex and agitated an order, so much against not only nature, but also the rhetorical art of speaking, unless the law of meter and the method of composing poetry might require it.

Notes on the Second Dano-Saxon Menologium

Taken from another Saxon Menologium written in prose, which still exists, mutilated, in the Cottonian library Julius A.10.
V. 6. On {by} eaecêŝan {by} Sic Menol. Sax. on {one} eaecêŝan geâhhebeâg h̃p {by} {one} moñer prîma. {by} man neq̃em h̃añûm̃y, {by} {by} on {one} gêhbœĉe, {by} âêtepe qeœla. {by} on {one} eaecêŝan beâg {by} cep̃an {Lsep_texts} nañâm âêtepe cêbpe p̃p̃an, {by} {by} nâm̃a p̃p̃an on {labege} û. {by} añd on {one} qeœla cœt̃er, {by} on {one} gêhbœĉe h̃âl̃êñd: 
V. 20. Ful̃p̃îña {by} ece {by} qeb̃îñŷt̃e} Menol. Sax. on {one} pex̃t̃ân beâg {by} {by} moñer b̃p̃e {by} meq̃a on {one} meq̃a {by} {one} G̃p̃êcâr neq̃em̃a Êp̃phana. {by} K̃ôm̃pêge h̃îñe neq̃em̃a Apânt̃a on. {by} {by} on {one} gêhbœĉe D̃p̃êñêt̃e âêtep̃ete beâg, {by} on {one} beâg he qeœla note {by} {by} mâ̂r̃t̃um pû. {by} {by} {by} peq̃an {by} {by} qeœla {by} {by} {by} [omitted text] {by} L̃p̃êt̃e. {by} Êa he peq̃an {by} {by} [omitted text] on {one} beâg L̃p̃êt̃e oñq̃êp̃ê p̃l̃b̃e he oñp̃ân neq̃añe {by} {by} {by} {by} Jôh̃âñêne G̃âm̃ p̃l̃b̃ê. *** on {one} beâg on {by} m̃û. m̃p̃êq̃âñê qêl̃p̃e qêl̃p̃e peq̃an pû l̃êñê peq̃âñê on {by} {by} b̃êt̃êr̃t̃êt̃ peqe. *** on {one} âc̃ân beâg L̃p̃êt̃e qeœlaqe p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. peq̃âñê on p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e q̃eoêm̃a on. p̃e ...
V. 149. Deaepe bungese Manur ucile. mana hi ylcan berge thele zexepan Philippus Jacob.] Menel. Sax. Sonae onone purcan monaep on zexep bie an an binghe baga. re monaep ip nemned on Leben Manur. la on upe gesebode Ephrimece. ypon pugl gesebodeurrere on 5eo on Ephrume. y eac on Ephrume lanne. on eam Ongia zewb com on 5er brecotone. si fi on xam monpe iepa on berge mylclben bopon next.

V. 184. In Onen looth Augurineur. 1 Menel. Sax. onone pix an pentaegazz bae mony hie pe Augurineucem gemyb peh bircopere. ze xepet eulphite boponre on 5er Brecotone. on anca pebpe 5e bircopere on doupobepserr 5epe Leasurere. si pe on Lante pensione. ond eur pohone 5e ne xtalbs blemu menn geseb. ond eur xerhyn carle to brecotone. y 5e xaratlice lanp ybbon apntene on Eungcyynere xerpe. si fi on Dtestpina Anglolum.

V. 205. Eppa hia uj to tene lunyur on gexep. 1 Menel. Sax. on xam yxvan monpe on zexep bie binghe baga. se monaep ip nemned on Leben lunar. la on upe geseboe se aepna lipa peb hon yep bie lopone mu ylice 5a pe pinbar. ond monnum bie 5one gesebne "mex" hy hiaf honne on 5er bhyme.

V. 214. Johaner pebpe acenere. 1 Menel. Sax. onone xecap an pentecuazaz bae mony bie pe Johaner acenere 5e xepurere. pe xepene menm xam sen Eupure. y Habretpe hea engel aceneur y xepene. y xepene hie xepen xam sen 5a xen aceneac pepe.

V. 265. pectomonap on tun pel hpat bungese Ayurur. 1 Menel. Sax. on xam eshegazz monpe on zexep bi5an xxx baga. onone monaep nemned on Leben Augurineucem. Romans barce bie nemned zepre 5e yoman. pop 5ona pebpe berge bae mony bie gepynembe Romans cynbdom. 1 openyrepe peb pe on bie tunonpon. la on upe gesebode pe nemned "mex" monaep pebpeemonap. pop 5ona xep on xam monpe bae zep omenap.

V. 279. Meppe bacon Laupentzur. 1 Menel. Sax. onone 5x" bae mony bie ru Laupentzur 5er acpibucnenur, ye xebe monnum blemu menn gesebpe.

V. 302. Aelingeri bieb. pe y xexyre u. mib xexyere oeperepepp, xexyre xenebape. 1 Menel. Sax. onone xxviii. bae mony bie pe Johaner 5opupax peb peicel eulphiteper. Sonne hte Nepoeter behexamur. pop 5ona pe he him loh 5e he xepere hie bropere pi peh him to xerepere. y 5e xexpere 5er bpean on bercpe 5e xepet xam xetucenump xipe plezaf to mebre 5aer peb baxpe xepere bopexonpe. &c.

V. 315. Dalis monaep xepumere xepen. 1 Menel. Sax. on xam niyoan monpe on zexep bi5an xxx baga. pe monaep harve Leben Sepentinbur. and on upe gesebode Dalis monaep. pop 5ona xep on upe xupen yapa da 5a hi hpite ponep on xam monpe hie xulpb hipto boexlepeton.

V. 322. Acenere peapn birkouner monop. 1 Menel. Sax. onone vix. bae mony bieb pe 5aupan acenerepe. hye xepene pay nemned loaschum. 5e xepene monop Anna. &c.

V. 330. Xyg onebene Machteur yur. 1 Menel. Sax. onone xxi bae mony bieb 5eay shporceur bie 5y Mathereur. ye 5e apeter mib lutusem thelonapex nu 5e xerhp omenep 5e jetereper, ac Eupure hie xepen 5a xepene. &c.

V. 341. Deab engleri tub on hezepere Michaeli. 1 Menel. Sax. onone xxviii. bae mony bieb pe 5ichaeli Lynicn geshyalgur in Tpacte 5eye Leasurere hepcapex 5ype manpye. Feonta menzgo com to 5eye Leasurere. *** onone bae1 yep 5e menpyope 5a Michaeli gemybpe.

V. 355. Octoberi on tun up to zemipere pintepyllebp. 1 Menel. Sax. on xam nopeane monpe on zexep bi5an xxx baga. Sonne monaep on Leben Octoberm. la on upe gesebode pintepyolk.


V. 376. blotmonap on tun boeunu to pyeye Novembeur. 1 Menel. Sax. on xam enblaypan monpe on zexep bi5an xxx baga. re monaep ip nemned on Leben Novembeur. la on upe gesebode blotmonap. popon 5ona xupen yapa hie yhpeene ponep, on xam monpe by blezton. 5e yep hie beteprone y benenbom hyn epolfokylbun yapa next da xep by polbon ryllan.
It seemed right to note these things from the Saxon Menologium which was written in prose, after the custom had grown of going on pilgrimage from the west parts of Europe to visit the Sepulchre of the Lord. That is, after the war began, called “holy,” which was taken up by the Christians to defend Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre, that was in the city, against the Saracens. This is understood from that which follows:

The same Menologium records the feast of St. George, which before was not recorded in calendars, established by the writer of the Menologium on the 23rd day of April in these words:
From these words, it is apparent that our Menologist was an egregious retailer of fables, in accord with the credulity of his age; as he recorded not only fictitious saints in his calendar, but related in it many false stories of true saints.

Moreover, how unskilled he was of more humane letters, in the science of astronomy and in the computation of Easter was rude, is not only shown by what he wrote of Saint George, and by his assigning a fixed date to the Feast of the Resurrection of the Lord, namely the 27th day of the month of March; but also by his attributing the Feast of Pentecost most absurdly to the 3rd day of May As can be seen from the following.

The days which at Alfred’s order were feast days and more solemn for the Anglo-Saxons:
The command of King Edgar on the observance of Sunday and on feasts and fasts of the Church:

Concerning the feasts, fasts, and days unfit for business which at Canute’s order were observed among the Anglo-Saxons:

Above I observed that the Calendar followed, as it were, a certain dithyrambic poem, in which the natures of things lacking a soul, the passions of animals, and
the customs of humans, are described in asyndetic verses without any connection. Now, this type of writing is not at all dissimilar to the dithyrambic one, which for the sake of Saxon lovers I have added from that most beautiful manuscript of the church of Exeter, which is mutilated in the beginning and the end ( alas!), but which contains varied and miscellaneous poems, copied without metrical marks.
Chapter Five: Analysis

The most groundbreaking chapter in the *Thesaurus* is Chapter 23, “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons.” It represents a major step forward in Anglo-Saxon studies because it provides the first application of a theoretical or critical apparatus to Anglo-Saxon poetry. Although there had been work on Anglo-Saxon poetry earlier, it was not until the *Thesaurus* that there was an attempt to codify a cohesive theory of poetics as they related to the Anglo-Saxon language, and this theory of poetry reflects that anxiety about language in general that preoccupied others in the eighteenth century. Chapter 23 is where Hickes explores his theory of poetic rhetoric. He extends the theory of linguistic purity and corruption to encompass Middle English as well in later chapters, dividing it up into several dialects ranked from purest to most corrupt, accordingly as they specifically derive from the Anglo-Saxon dialects.

Hickes begins the chapter with an outline of the procession of topics: language; meter; rhythm; and finally, “with respect to what occurs in poems, especially that which renders things written poetically by the Anglo-Saxons so thorny and difficult to understand.”

Hickes divides the Anglo-Saxon dialects into various categories in chapters 20 through 22. First, there is “pure” Saxon.

---

166 Hickes, *Thesaurus*, 177. “Poetica Anglo-Saxonum consideranda est, vel respectu *sermonis*, in quo poemata scribuntur; vel respectu *metri*, cuius tota ratio versatur circa pedes vel quantitatem & mensuram syllabarum, quae poemata à prosā scriptis distinguunt; vel tertio respectu *rythmi*, qui consistit in systemate seu collectione pedum, quorum tempora aliquam ad se inivicem habent rationem seu aptam proportionem, ex diversorum temporum vel motuum concinna & convenienti mensura compositam; vel denique respectu eorum quae carminibus accidunt, præsertim verum istorum, quæ poetice ab *Anglo-Saxonibus* scripta tam spinosa & intellectu difficilia reddunt.”
“Pure Saxon” consists of the language of such authors as Ælfric, Alfred, Wulfstan, and the author of the poetic *encomium urbis*, “Durham.” Cædmon, and the Cædmonian Genesis are the only examples of “British-Saxon.” Lastly, there is “Dano-Saxonic,” a language which encompasses *Beowulf*, and that Hickes believes is greatly corrupted from “pure” Saxon. He makes it clear that the poems “constructed in purer Saxon [...] should be called Saxon poems, but those poems which are in the Dano-Saxonic dialect should be called Dano-Saxonic.”

Although Hickes treats prose discourse in earlier chapters, this chapter is for Hickes to explicate and elaborate on the poetry. In Hickes’s theory Dano-Saxonic becomes “Semi-Saxon,” and “pure Saxon” becomes “Norman-Saxon,” which he explains more fully in Chapter 24.

One of Hickes’s main goals is to illustrate for the reader the construction of poetry in both pure Saxon and Dano-Saxonic, beginning with syntax and vocabulary choices. This helps the absolute novice begin to dissect and analyze the poetry. He distinguishes between the two Anglo-Saxon “dialects” early in chapter 23 by saying, “Saxon poems, just like those things that are written more purely in prose, are generally free from strange words, as also from those barbarisms, which in Dano-Saxonic poems sometimes either distort the syntax itself or seem to distort it.”

Discussing the translation of a psalm contained in

---

167 Hickes, 177. “Poemata, quæ in Saxonico puriori contextuntur, poemata Saxonica, quæ autem in Dano-Saxonicâ dialecto panguntur carmina, Dano-Saxonica vocanda censemus.”

168 Hickes, 177. “Poemata Saxonica, perinde ac ea, quæ purius in prosa oratione scribuntur, ab exoticis plerumque vocibus immunia sunt, ut & à barbarismis illis, qui in Dano-Saxonice interdum vel syntaxin ipsam depravant vel depravare videntur.”
the night office of the Benedictine Rule in Junius 121, Chapter 25, folio 41, he remarks, “There is no Dano-Saxonic barbarism in these examples, no shaky syntax, words departing from the common use of those who wrote in prose, except no one word, *breome or breona* in the former, and *foldan* in the latter example. Otherwise, in each, the poem is as familiar in its language as prose and equally easy to understand.”  

Vocabulary is not the only major distinction between the differing dialects. Syntax, especially syntax driven by vocabulary concerns, also plays an important role in the differentiation of dialects. The idea of linguistic purity manifests itself clearly here, as does the desire to differentiate poetry from prose.

Hickes moves on to a long discussion of meter and syllabic manipulation as it relates to metric constraints. Although he clearly does not understand completely how poetic meter is working in the poems, Hickes attempts to show the reader how poems were composed rhythmically:

The reader will perceive in the examples given below that the poems of the Anglo-Saxons, both Saxon and Dano-Saxonic, consist of verses, or rather of verselets, of three, four, five, six, seven, eight, and sometimes of nine syllables, and even more, connected in an uncertain arrangement, but very elegantly and rhythmically. For the most part, one sees verselets of four and five syllables, with verses of fewer or more syllables interspersed at will, as it seems to me, and without rules.

---

169 Hickes, 180. “Nihil in his Dano-Saxonice barbariei, nihil labefactatæ syntaxeos, nihil abhorrentium vocum à communi usu solute scribentium, præter unam *breome t breona* in priore, & *foldan* in posteriore exemplo.”

170 Hickes, 180-1. “Percipiet enim in exemplis, quæ infra damus, carmina Anglo-Saxonum, quum Saxonica, tum Dano-Saxonica consistere ex vesibus, seu potius versiculis trium, quattuor, quinque, sex, septem, octo, & quandoque novem syllabarum, & qui excedunt, ordine sane non certo, sed concinne valde & rythmice conjunctis.”
Elegance, although important, is not the only criterion for Hickes. He is also keen to demonstrate the quantitative rhythm of the poetry, which is important for him. If the rhythm is accounted for properly, then the reader should have no trouble seeing the difference between poetry and prose in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Furthermore, the rhythm gives the poetry power and elegance.

Hickes tells of his first experience of reading Anglo-Saxon poetry directly from the manuscript:

Truly when I was a novice in Saxon matters and had come in reading the Saxon Chronicle to the year 938, immediately from the graceful opening of the poem, which affected me through the power of the rhythm, I perceived the discourse to be metrical, although it was written continuously, in the manner of prose. And indeed, although I was unaware of the meaning of the words then and also of the quantity of the syllables and the tempos of the feet, nevertheless I perceived a certain graceful symmetry of the parts in this poem, and I understood what I had read to be verses from the power of the quantities which I did not perceive in the prose of other annals lacking metrical qualities.¹⁷¹

He compares the poetry of the Anglo-Saxons with the poetry of poets such as Cowley and Waller, both popular poets of the seventeenth century:

Thus indeed our poets, and likewise foreign poets throughout all Europe — among whom there is a single law of poetry — observe a certain and definite number of syllables, observing any quantity of syllables. Nowadays this alone makes a verse: whatever the nature and quantity of the syllables, it is reckoned to be a verse when they have heaped up a

¹⁷¹ Hickes, 188. “Equidem cum in Saxonics tyro essem, in legendo chroniclo Saxonico ventum esset ad annum DCCCC.XXXXVIII protinus ex carminis decoro incessu, quo me pro viribus rythmi afficibat, orationem percipiebam esse metricam, esti continuo scripta erat, instar liberæ orationis. Etenim quamvis verborum sensum tum nesciebam, ut & quantitatem syllabarum & temporae pedum, venustam tamen partium quondam symmetriam in isto poemate discerniebam, versusque esse quos legi intelligiebam, ex vi numerorum, quam in libera & numeris metricis carenti aliorum annorum oratione non sentiebam.”
certain number of syllables. The observation of metrical feet is accordingly missing among today’s poems; if they occur anywhere, it comes about purely by accident, not by craft or by effort, since it is lawful to put in syllables of whatever measure you wish in any place randomly, so that one could say about the verses of this century that they flow in only one foot. But in Anglo-Saxon poems, as is justifiable to believe, the quantity of syllables, or the usage of metrical feet is not neglected in this way, even if perhaps they do not observe the reckoning of poetic measures and quantities as strictly as the heroic Greek and Latin poets of old.\textsuperscript{172}

The scorn in the comparison is palpable, especially later when he declares “[…] Anglo-Saxon is rich to the extent that, emulating Latin, it seems to claim for itself second, or at least third place among languages, after Greek,”\textsuperscript{173} in specific reference to compound words, the lack of which in English compels modern poets “to pile up eight or ten monosyllables in a verse, and therefore there is no reason that [the Anglo-Saxons] might neglect the quantity of syllables and metric feet much at all […].”\textsuperscript{174} This is also a point on which Swift remarked in his \textit{Proposal}, and one of the few points on which Hickes and Swift agree.

\textsuperscript{172} Hickes, 186. “Ita quidem nostri, ita etiam exteri, per totam \textit{Europam} poëtæ, apud quos una carminis lex est, certum & definitum syllabarum numerum observare, nulla tamen observata syllabarumquantitate. Hoc solum jam versum facit, cujuscunque vero naturæ & temporis istæ syllabæ fuerint, id perinde esse creditur, modo certum syllabarum numerum coacervaverint. Abest itaque ab hodiernis carminibus pedum \textit{metricorum} observatio, qui si ullibi occurrunt, casu sane id sit, non arte, aut studio, cum promiscue licitum sit cujusvis mensuræ syllabas cuilibet aptare loco, adeo ut de hujus seculi versibus dici positis, illos uno tantum pede decurrere. Ast in \textit{Anglo-Saxonum} poematis, ut par est credere, non ita negligitur syllabarumquantitas, vel pedum metricorum observatio, esti forsan non stricte habent temporum & numerorum poeticorum rationem, quam heroici veteres \textit{Graeci} & Latini poetæ.”

\textsuperscript{173} Hickes, 188. “Adhæc, patronymica, gentilia, possessive, denominativa, composite, & decomposita, carmini omnia sunt apta, in quibus adeo est dives \textit{Anglo-Saxonica}, ut post \textit{Græcam Latinae} emula secundum, saltem tertium locum inter linguas vindicare sibi videatur.”

\textsuperscript{174} Hickes 188. “Non in hac ut in nostra scribentes \textit{Poëtæ} coacti erant octo vel decem monosyllaba simul in versu coacervare, ideoque syllabarum quantitatem & pedes metricos, ut multum saltem negligerent, ratio non patitur, ut credamus.”
The treatment of meter is combined with an explicit reference to Aristotelian and Ciceronian rhetoric in Hickes’s description of three levels of style in prose discourse. He comments that “[…] all learned people acknowledge” a three-tier system of discourse, parallel to that described in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* and Cicero’s *Orator*. Hickes changes this slightly from high, middle, and low styles to create a system of rhetorical analysis more appropriate to his topic of Anglo-Saxon poetics. The classical system evolves in the *Thesaurus* to become a “threelfold arrangement of words […] one, indeed, in the discourse of those speaking and writing simply; another in rhetorical discourse; and a third in poetic or metrical discourse.” The system has been changed to low and middle styles, which Hickes equates with prose discourse, both in Chapter 23 and in earlier chapters. Poetic style, which he turns into the high style, deserves a category all its own, and it is this style which he critically analyzes in Chapter 23.

This use of Aristotelian and Ciceronian levels of style is an explicit linking of the Anglo-Saxon tradition to an earlier classical tradition. This gives the native Germanic tradition legitimacy by the association with the much more prestigious classical tradition. In much the same way, the Church of England derived legitimacy by deriving its practices and forms from the much older traditions of the Anglo-Saxon church, aided by Hickes and his associates. This is further

---

175 Hickes, 187. “Triplicem enim esse dictionum in oratione dispositionem omnes docti aeque noscunt; alteram nempe in simpliciter loquentium & scribentium oratione, alteram in oratione oratoria, & tertiam in poetica vel metrica oratione.”
paralleled by the way in which Hickes continually ranks Latin and Greek poetry with Anglo-Saxon throughout the chapter.

He treats rhythm next in the chapter, noting that,

This suitable arrangement and proportionality of the feet, [...] in poetry, is, as it were, the soul of meter, from which comes, if I may say so, not only the life but the beauty and the charm and indeed all that power by which poetry moves and soothes the spirit and the emotions and rises above all the power of prose; in a word, meter without rhythm makes the verse faulty, disorganized, and rough, [...].¹⁷⁶

For Hickes, rhythm is of paramount importance, as it was the beauty of the rhythm of the poetry which, he says, attracted him to the study of Anglo-Saxon in the first place, as noted earlier in this chapter.

His treatment of rhythm is incomplete, because, as he admits, the lack of specific knowledge as to the length and quantity of the syllables in the spoken language hinders the knowledge of how rhythm worked in poetry and metrical prose: “[...] ignorance of this one thing hinders us so that we are less able to reveal the secrets of Anglo-Saxon poesy, both metrical and lyrical [...]”¹⁷⁷ His lack of knowledge of quantity of the syllables leads him to break the text not into the half-lines separated by a cæsura and linked by alliteration that modern editions present, but rather into short single lines, which more closely resemble

¹⁷⁶ Hickes,188. “Hæc autem apta pedum in carmine constitutio & proportio, est quasi anima metri, ex qua non tantum vita, si ita dicam, sed decor & venustas, imo & omnia illa virtus, qua animum & affectus carmen movet & sedat, & supra omnem efficaciam solutæ orationis surgit [...]”

¹⁷⁷ Hickes,189. “[...] cujus unius ignorantia obstat, quo minus Anglo-Saxonice poësios secreta, quà metrica, quid si dicam, quà lyricæ, aperire possimus.”
the Latin model that Hickes used to analyze the poetry. He recognizes assonance and alliteration in the poetry, but is unsure as to what it means except as a rhetorical device: “it brings attractiveness, splendor, and sometimes majesty to metrical discourse, when inserted here and there like a harmony of sounds, for the purpose of restoring the spirit and stirring the emotions.”

Hickes’s choice of texts in Chapter 23 is significant as well, and serves a twofold purpose. First, the medieval texts that Hickes chooses to illustrate his points are often lesser known texts, with the exception of the so-called Caedmonian Genesis, Bodleian Library, Ms. Junius 11, which had been published in 1655. Although most of the texts he includes in Chapter 23 had been previously published, they had not yet been subjected to critical scrutiny and analysis; these poems include the Fight at Finnsburh; the poems of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; Judith; the Old English Menologium; Durham; and the Meters of Boethius. Interestingly, the texts Hickes presents to his readers are in both “pure” Saxonic and “Dano-Saxon,” the dialect that he had previously referred to as “barbaric.” Even more unusually, the text that he offers his readers as a way in “which you will be able to test the rules given by us and to find out whether they respond to our wishes and your expectation,” close to the end of the

178 Hickes, 197. “Verum quamvis hæc in Græcorum & Latinorum heroïcis merito damnanda est, in Anglo-Saxonum tamen carminibus, quæ alius indolis ac structuræ sunt, venustatem, nitorem, & nonnumquam majestatem metricæ orationi conciliat, hic illic ad recreandum animum & affectus excitandos, tanquam symphonia concinentium, interposita.”

179 Hickes, 203. “& ne tibi jam præceptis munto deessent, in quibus diligentiam, & ingenium tuum exerceas, tractatulum metricum, quoad sermonem Dano-Saxonice scriptum in calce hujus
chapter, is not a Saxon treatise, but rather the *Menologium*, written in “Dano-Saxonic,” with Hickes’s own Latin translation accompanying it. He states in his introduction to the poem that he was asked to publish it with a Latin translation by various learned colleagues, and he desired to do it for “both the beauty of the poetry and the lack of poetic books.”

It is phrase “the infrequency of poetic books,” that gives a strong clue to Hickes’s first intent in publishing such seemingly irrelevant and obscure texts, and even “corrupt” and “barbaric” texts. Although there were scholars and antiquaries interested in the recovery of Anglo-Saxon toward the middle of the sixteenth century, specifically Lawrence Nowell, William Lambarde, Robert Talbot and John Leland, it was not until the 1560s and the work of Archbishop Matthew Parker and his associates that Anglo-Saxon was subjected to concentrated study. The efforts of the Parker circle focused primarily on chronicles and religious texts in an attempt to provide precedent for many of the political and religious decisions that accompanied the reign of the Tudors. Parker himself was a driving force in Anglo-Saxon scholarship, providing multiple texts for printing and amassing a collection of manuscripts which would become valuable to future scholars. Work on Anglo-Saxon texts largely ground to a halt with the death of Queen Elizabeth and the accession of James I.

---

180 Hickes, 203. “Hoc quoque ut facerem, tum pulchritudo carminis, & librorum metricorum infrequentia [...].”

Robert Cotton continued his collection of manuscripts, and William L’Isle worked on Old English translations during the 1620s and 30s, but did not publish. The next major publication did not occur until the 1640s until Wheelock’s publication of his editions of Bede and the Chronicle, and a reprint of Lambarde’s *Archaionomia*.

Anglo-Saxon poetry had not yet been recognized as poetry because of the written format of the texts: straight linear format like prose, with no separations into individual poetic lines or verses, although in some poems there were metrical markers. Laurence Nowell annotated some Anglo-Saxon poetry, as established by his ownership of the codex in which *Beowulf* appears and some glossing of the Exeter Book poems.182 There was little work on poetry or poetic texts in general after Nowell until the Dutch philologist Francis Junius (1591-1677) began his work in England. When Junius began to recognize Anglo-Saxon poetry on the basis of metrical structure, it was a major turning point for the study of Anglo-Saxon poetics; the notion that there was no Anglo-Saxon poetry was dispelled, and serious investigation of poetry and poetic theory commenced. Junius’ edition of the “Caedmonian” *Genesis*, published in 1655, was the first published poetry that attempted to mark out metrics and line structure, based on metrical points in his source manuscript, Bodleian Library Junius 11.183

---

Although Junius’s edition of *Genesis* was relatively well-known to scholars of the language, there was a serious scarcity of other poetic texts available for study in print. Christopher Rawlinson, whom Hickes hails as “The most illustrious […] born to promote good literature,” had produced an edition of the Anglo-Saxon *Meters* of Boethius for print in 1698.\textsuperscript{184} Earlier, Wheelock had printed Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* with Cædmon’s Hymn, and an edition of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle together with the poems (1644), but gave no sign that he understood the poems to be poetry. Although libraries and private collectors were generally very generous in loaning out and providing access to manuscripts as evidenced by Hickes’s own selections from the Bodleian and Cambridge libraries, among other libraries and collectors, many important manuscripts remained in private collections at this time. Despite the willingness of collectors and libraries to lend texts to scholars and the merely curious alike, the circulation of texts was still limited by geographical proximity, and the small number of poetic manuscripts available.

In many ways, the *Thesaurus* solved this limitation for students and teachers of Anglo-Saxon: it provided access for scholars and students of the language to rare and generally unknown texts to work with. The monumental *Librorum veterum septentrionalium … catalogus historico-criticus* of Humfrey Wanley, which appeared as a second volume to the *Thesaurus*, provided further

\textsuperscript{184} Hickes, 177. “Poemata codicem nobis dedit cl. vir juvandus bonis literis natus Christoph. Rawlinson […]”
information for the reader to obtain texts on his own, but the Thesaurus was a critical intermediary in disseminating Anglo-Saxon texts, especially poetic texts, to a much larger audience. Hickes specifically states that he knows that his real contribution is to provide a starting point for students, himself having had “no guide we might follow in these pathless places, although we will have many who will follow us with greater success, which we desire.” The Menologium may have been in a “barbaric” dialect, but it was in an Anglo-Saxon dialect and it was poetic; that was all the justification that Hickes needed for including it in the Thesaurus and giving it such a place of prominence in Chapter 23 as an exemplar. Indeed, if all Hickes’s plans had come to fruition, the Thesaurus would have been followed by a number of other editions of important Anglo-Saxon works, prose and poetic, including William Elstob’s edition of the laws, and his sister Elizabeth’s monumental and ambitious edition of Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies. This turned out not to be the case, but had Hickes’s publishing plan worked out, there would have been a relative flood of Anglo-Saxon texts for scholars in relatively short order. Since this did not come to pass for a number of reasons, Hickes’s texts of these poems remain an important source; and in the case of the Finnsburgh Fragment, the only surviving text of the poem.

The second reason for the choice of the texts may have been a far more personal one. Seth Lerer directly addresses Hickes’s choice of poetry in this

---

185 Hickes, 195. “[…] quem in his inviis sequeremur, neminem habentes, at qui nos sequentur majori cum successu multos, quod optamus, habituri.”
chapter in his 2001 article, “The Anglo-Saxon Pindar: Old English Scholarship and Augustan Criticism in George Hickes’s *Thesaurus.*” Lerer points out that the poems Hickes chooses are meaningful in their own way. The politically and religiously conservative Hickes, along with many other influential churchmen, around four hundred of them, refused to take the oath of allegiance to William of Orange and Mary after the Glorious Revolution of 1688. That Hickes felt strongly against taking the oath of allegiance to William and Mary is evident in his pamphlet *Jovian:*

> [...] if it please God to suffer a Popish Prince to reign over us, rather than he should prove a Julian indeed to undermine our religion by crafty arts and tempt us out of it by Worldly Honours and Rewards. I heartily wish for the Churches good that he may prove a Maximin or Diocletian (I mean a down-right Bloody persecutor) though I was the Proto-Martyr of the Cause. I speak this not relying on my own Strength, but on the Gracious Alliance of God, in whom I trust that he will inspire me with the boldness of a Confessor, and the Patience, Courage, and Constancy of a Martyr, whencesoever he shall please to call me to Confess his truths and suffer for his Holy Name.186

By the end of 1689, Hickes’s precarious position as a non-juror caused him to be stripped of his position as the Dean of Worcester, and “[...] for most of his life thereafter he lived in trouble, infirmity, poverty and persecution (not to mention a wife prejudiced against ‘the uncourtly Gothic and Saxon’).”187 He lived as an outlaw in hiding for much of the rest of his life while attempting to evade the arrest warrant for nailing a refusal to surrender the deanery to the door of

186 “*Jovian; or, an Answer to Julian the Apostate,***” 299.
187 J. A. W. Bennett, "Hickes's *Thesaurus,***” 29.
Worcester Cathedral, and for various other crimes, including consecrating new bishops without the permission of the monarchy, which was punishable by death.

When Chapter 23 opens, it does so with Metrum Three of The Meters of Boethius, detailing the soul’s struggles against “strongan stormas […] weoruld bisgunga,” (the strong storms of worldly cares). This sets the tone for the rest of the chapter.\textsuperscript{188} The same theme follows through much of the other poetry he selects to illustrate his points in the chapter. The poetry is generally concerned with chaos, destruction, sacrifice, loss, grief, and care: the sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham; the destruction of the city of Sodom; the disastrous Fight at Finnsburgh; the Fall of the Angels; the flood battering the walls of the city of Durham; the dark and dangerous path that the Icelandic heroine Hervar travels to summon her murdered father and his followers from their graves and claim his sword for her revenge against his murderer.

The modern poets he chooses to illustrate his text are also concerned with these same issues: Waller, Donne, Dryden, Cowley, and John Denham. The fragments of poetry that Hickes chooses from these authors, as Lerer puts it, “come from poems on dissent and treason, loyalty and betrayal: themes that were all part and parcel of Hickes’s own highly charged political and social life during the decade that the Thesaurus was taking shape.”\textsuperscript{189} His choice of

\textsuperscript{188} Lerer, “The Anglo-Saxon Pindar” 37.
Dryden’s poem *Absalom and Achitophel* is particularly interesting, dealing as it does with the conspiracy against the lawful heir to the throne by the thinly disguised Duke of Monmouth (Absalom) and the Earl of Shaftesbury (Achitophel). Hickes’s choice was perhaps made even more poignant by the execution of his brother, John Hickes, for his part in the Monmouth Rebellion in 1685.

Given that Hickes used the *Thesaurus* to comment on his own political and religious problems, it is not at all surprising that he also uses it to comment on religion, and the Roman Catholic religion to which he was so vehemently opposed. The recovery of Anglo-Saxon began as an attempt on the part of the Parker circle and its associates to justify the legitimacy of the Church of England, and reaffirm the use of the vernacular Scriptural and homiletic tradition as established in pre-Norman England, as well as a refutation of the laws of the Roman Church.

A man of strict religious and political principles, Hickes himself had used an Anglo-Saxon text in an earlier treatise, *An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England* (1687), to demonstrate the legitimacy of episcopal authority in the Church of England. He cites the authority of the “[…] Saxon Bishops, one of who, in his Advice to his Clergy, speaks thus ‘Ye ought to know, that your Order is next after, and next to ours; for as the Bishops are in the place and stead of the Apostles, over the Holy Church, so are the Priests in the place of the Disciples. The Bishops are of the order of Aaron, and the Priests have the order of his
Alongside his translation of the text, Hickes provides the Anglo-Saxon text, taken from Spelman’s *Concilia*. He seems quite unaware that the authority in question is *not* a Saxon bishop at all. The quotation derives originally from the *Capitula* of Theodulf of Orleans, and though originally a Latin text, it was translated at a later date into Anglo-Saxon, and it is this copy, now in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS. 201, that Spelman used in the *Concilia*, and that Hickes took the quotation from.

Chapter 23 demonstrates this same disdain for the Roman Catholic Church that Hickes displays in the *Vindication*. The clearest and most vehement example of this occurs in the notes to the *Menologium*, for line 284, discussing the poet’s treatment of the Virgin Mary. Hickes comments that, “Indeed concerning the Virgin Mary, the Anglo-Saxon church was accustomed to feel and speak so temperately that not even poets would write about her beyond what was appropriate,” and commends the poet of the *Heliand* for doing the same. He then levels an accusation of blasphemy against the Roman Church in what he sees as its overly fulsome praise of the Virgin: “[...] blasphemies not only of Anselm, Bernard, and other writers of the Roman Church, but also of the sacred offices of the blessed Virgin of the Roman Church itself, which having been
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compiled into a book written in English, whose title is ‘The Mirror of the Blessed Virgin,’ it grieves me to repeat here.”

It is not surprising that Hickes would feel this way. For him, Roman Catholicism was a legitimate threat, and even though he supported the Roman Catholic James II as King of England by divine right of kingship, he was firmly Anglican. Politics and religion were still solidly tied together at this time, although the conflict between partisans of James II and those of William of Orange and Mary signaled the beginning of the end. If the seventeenth century was about chaos and unrest, on political, social, and religious levels, the eighteenth century was about the restoration of order from chaos and preventing England from slipping back into the unrest and disorder of the previous century. During the seventeenth century, England had endured a huge amount of change in a relatively short period of time: the end of the Tudors, the installation of the Stuarts, the deposition of the Stuarts, the Interregnum, the Restoration of the Stuarts, a rebellion, the execution of one king and the abdication of another, religious unrest and fragmentation, and the strongest stirrings yet of exploration and empire building. This change was usually chaotic and undisciplined, states abhorred by the faintly emerging strains of the rational Enlightenment in the seventeenth century. If the seventeenth century was chaotic, the eighteenth
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century sought to restore order from the chaos and prevent any future decline into chaos. Religion, politics, social hierarchies, scholastic endeavors, had all suffered from this descent into unrest, and the goal of the eighteenth century was to prevent it from happening again and to correct the damage inflicted by this loss of rationality. To Hickes, bred so solidly in the pre-Enlightenment Anglican tradition, the Roman Catholic Church represented nothing less than the superstition and lack of temperance that had so characterized the chaos of the Stuart era. His anti-Catholic comments in Chapter 23 reflect this mode of thinking.

Finally, there is the issue of linguistic anxiety to consider in Chapter 23. Hickes refers to “pure” and “corrupt” or “foreign” language, and reviles contemporary poets for their abuses of language. This notion of “pure” English manifested itself throughout English society as an anxiety over the direction of the language and confusion about the origins of the language. This anxiety about English linguistic identity manifested itself in a few key ways. First, there was a deep desire to “explore” English as a language, in much the same way as an attempt to explore foreign lands, and the development of prescriptive grammar in England. There were a number of new “maps” of the language printed in the form of grammars of English, including Gildon and Brightland in 1711, Greenwood, also in 1711, and Maittaire in 1712.\textsuperscript{193} These grammars wavered

between wanting to present English in an entirely Latin model and desiring to break free of the Latinate model entirely and forge a new and thoroughly English model for language pedagogy. Brightland’s revision of the grammar of 1711 was subtitled “The Whole Making a Compleat System for an English Education.” Unsurprisingly, these grammars all recommended the reformation and study of grammar along classical models.

A crucial part of the debate focused on this issue: which direction was it appropriate for the language to take? Theories about Indo-European poetics only began to be developed in the late 1780s, so there was no clear sense of how languages related to one another, beyond surface similarities. There was also the prestige factor to consider: Latin was a much more prestigious language than English or Anglo-Saxon. This muddied the issue even further.

Second, there was a drive to establish a national regulating body for the regulation and the reform of the English language, in the same form as the establishment of the Accademia della Crusca in Italy in 1582, and the Académie Française in 1635. Much of the impetus for this kind of language reform in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries began with the Inkhorn Controversy, a debate over the adoption of Latinate words into English, and continued with the efforts of the Royal Society to reform English. The Inkhorn Controversy (c. 1560-1640) revolved around so-called “inkhorn terms,” foreign words, usually those of some pretention, or a word created from an existing word root by an English speaker. The need for these words was especially high
in the sixteenth century during the shift from Middle English, and the transition from Latin to English as a newly emerging primary language for science and the arts. In need of new terms for developing fields of study, such as science, writers began importing Greek and Latin terms into English. The controversy debated to what extent these inkhorn terms were acceptable in English. Opponents of the inkhorn terms tried to resurrect older Germanic terms or create new words based on Germanic roots in an attempt to speak plainly.

At the same time, creations on the Continent of bodies to regulate languages were gaining steam. The Accademia della Crusca (1582) founded in Florence was created to distance itself from the more formal Accademia Florentina, while still maintaining literary ambitions. In 1590, the Accademia began a large-scale dictionary project, the Vocabolario. Drawing on major Italian authors, particularly Florentine authors such as Dante, as well as contemporary poets and writers, they compiled a monumental dictionary, printed in Venice in 1612. The reviews were mixed; some objected to the Florentine-centered examples used in the Vocabolario, although the dictionary is defended as having “represented for centuries, in a politically and linguistically divided Italy, the most precious collection of the common language, the strongest internal bond of the Italian community, and an indispensable tool for all those who wanted to write in good Italian.”

The Académie Française was founded in 1635 by Cardinal Richelieu, and has played much the same role in French culture that the Accademia has in Italian, namely the codification and sanction of the “official” versions of the language, although the rulings are largely recommendations and are not legally binding. The journal of the Académie, Recueil des Harangues prononcées par Messieurs de l’Académie Françoise dans leurs réceptions, & en d’autres occasions différentes, depuis l’establissement de l’Académie jusqu’à présent, was first published in 1694.195

The problem was that England had no comparable body for the regulation of language. The best that England could produce was the Royal Society, which had been founded primarily as a scientific academy, not a linguistic and philological body, and it remains a scientific body, interested in the promotion of math and science education. However, one of the first major projects undertaken by the Royal Society, founded in 1645, was in fact a project to improve the English language. By 1664, the Royal Society had established a “Committee for Improving the English Language,”196 and John Wilkins, the Bishop of Chester from 1668, wrote a treatise for the Society entitled An Essay Towards a Real Character and a Philosophical Language, published in 1668. Such notables as Swift, Daniel Defoe, John Dryden, and John Evelyn all urged the establishment of an
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academy at various points. This is the perceived deficiency that Swift’s Proposal addressed, blissfully ignoring the fact that the Royal Society was trying to establish one itself.

Although Chapter 23 of the Thesaurus, “On the Poetic Art of the Anglo-Saxons,” represents the first sustained attempt to apply a critical and theoretical apparatus to Anglo-Saxon poetry, using rhetorical theory and poetics to analyze the construction of the poetry, another concern in the text is Hickes’s attempt to delineate a “purer” language from the various dialects represented in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. The question is, what did Hickes mean by “purer” language and how was he defining each of the dialects he perceived in the language? In Chapter 19, he says that the language should be separated into three time periods, and each epoch has its own dialect. The first division is from the entry of the Angles and Saxons into England to the Danish invasions; this period in his estimation lasted 337 years, and the only remnant is the true Cædmon from Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica and perhaps the Cotton Harmony of the Gospels. Next, there is the language from the arrival of the Danes in England up to the Norman invasion, a period of 274 years. In his view, the language had particularly suffered extreme corruption in southern Scotland and northern England where there had been a heavy influx of Danish settlers early on; their “corrupt” language Hickes referred to as “Dano-Saxon.” The examples of the
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language Hickes offers here are the interlinear Rushworth Gospels and the Cotton Gospels, which he proposes to deal with more fully in Chapter 20. The last period is from the arrival of the Normans to the reign of Henry II, and Hickes proposes to call the dialect by the complex name of “Norman-Dano-Saxonic.”\textsuperscript{199} Middle English is thus “Semi-Saxonic.”\textsuperscript{200}

Hickes directly addresses the two major Anglo-Saxon forms in Chapter 23, “pure Saxon,” and “Dano-Saxon,” the lesser of the two languages, because of its “foreignness,” a key term for Hickes, who sought to separate out what he believed to be the true Anglo-Saxon from other languages which he believed to have introduced “abhorrent” elements into Saxon poetry. As always, Cædmon is held up as the true model for all Anglo-Saxon poetry. Some of the poetic elements introduced by the Danes, according to Hickes, include strange words that are not used in prose, strange syntax, and the vague complaint of “barbarisms,” although they do agree in meter. In his analysis of the poem “Durham,” Hickes comments that the poem is free of any Dano-Saxon barbarisms, and only uses two words of non-prose extraction.

Compared to the section on meter, the language analysis by Hickes is amazingly brief and vague. Although he treated Dano-Saxonic in Chapter 20, even there, the description remains somewhat ambiguous. This is certainly not

\textsuperscript{199} Hickes, \textit{Thesaurus}, 88.
\textsuperscript{200} See David Matthews’ translation of Hickes’ comments on Semi-Saxon in \textit{The Invention of Middle English: An Anthology of Primary Sources}, (University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University Press), 2000.
due to any coyness or reluctance on Hickes’s part, but a symptom of his uncertainty; he is literally exploring entirely on his own, having no predecessors in this, and “leaving a trail for others to follow.” Furthermore, it is a bit odd that he is basing his entire foundation for a “pure” dialect on one, possibly two, poems. Like Swift and his perceptions of contemporary English, Hickes is not seeing the evolution of the language so much as he is seeing dramatic upheavals in the language, based on his perceptions of history. To Hickes, the appearance of the Danish was a rapid invasion, and he seems to see the change in the language as relatively sudden. Although we know that adoption of Danish loanwords and syntactical change was through a slower process of settlement and assimilation, from his limited perspective, and perhaps limited knowledge, Hickes is trying to make sense of what he has.

This then begs the question: why is a “pure” dialect being posited on such slim and scanty evidence? Perhaps we can excuse Hickes on the grounds that his understanding of how languages evolve was poor, and his picture about relationships between languages was incomplete. If Lerer is correct that Hickes chose poems that reflect his own changed circumstances, and most of Hickes’s poetry selections do have a powerful rhetoric of loss and grief underlying them, is it possible that something similar is at work in this case as well? Hickes is seeing a “Golden Age” in Anglo-Saxon England, an age that was pure in its beliefs and ideas, before being tainted first by the barbarism of the Danes, and then by the invasion of the Normans. Certainly, the accession of the Catholic
James II and then William and Mary to the throne of England must have seemed as traumatic to Hickes as the Danish invasions and then the Norman invasion would have been to the Anglo-Saxons. In the time before the Danes, ideas and languages were consistent and people had a uniformity of practice of customs, much as the Restoration had seemed. Cædmon’s Hymn, and the dialect predicated on it, represents stability and consistency of belief, something Hickes did not have in his own circumstance. Cædmon’s Hymn does not contain that rhetoric of grief and loss; instead it celebrates the eternalness of God, His love for His creation, and the might of the Lord.

Hickes, like Swift, was concerned with the direction that language was taking, especially poetic language. The *Thesaurus* was in part an attempt to try and to reconcile the past with the present, and provide a road-map for the future. Although much of his supposition about Old English poetry is not correct, it is still important for modern scholars to understand what Hickes was trying to do. The analysis of the poetry represents an important step forward in the study of the language as more than a philological specimen. Instead, Hickes is trying to cast the poetry as worthy of being studied for its own sake, not just as a linguistic oddity. Furthermore, his chapters represents the first critical approach to studying Anglo-Saxon poetry, notable for that reason if nothing else. Although Hickes and Swift shared much in common, Hickes and the Oxford Saxonists’ radically new philological analysis and appeal to textual authority irked Swift and caused him to lash out at them. While Swift might indeed have objected to
Hickes’s politics, to say that it was the only reason he attacked the Saxonists would be a shallow dismissal of Swift as a language scholar in his own right. Swift was as passionate about his own ideas about language as Hickes was about his; the difference is that while Swift thrived on conflict and debate, Hickes did not. He had been involved with enough conflict in his personal and professional life, and there is no doubt that it adversely affected his health.

I believe Hickes was trying to improve the contemporary language, particularly poetic discourse, but there is an element of pure enjoyment in the study of language as well in Chapter 23. He loved Anglo-Saxon for its own sake, and wanted others to love it as well. One can almost sense his joy when he discusses the beauty of *Brunanburh* and how it affected him. He also remarks that he wants the reader to find the poetry of the Anglo-Saxons “[…] pleasant and useful to read,” and he no doubt tried his hardest to make it so, despite his deficiencies and his mistaken assumptions.

Swift and Hickes had the same goal: improving the English language. That both Swift and his contemporaries and Hickes and his collaborators felt strongly about this there is no doubt. Eleanor Adams quotes John Bale as having said “[…] I have found none so negligent and untoward as I have found in England on the due search of their ancient histories […].”201 Both Hickes and
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Swift would have been in agreement with Bale on this point, but their interpretations varied. Both men were unquestionably anxious about the state of the English language, and about English national interests as reflected in the language. For Hickes, the key was in the “pure” Anglo-Saxon poetry and the theories of poetics presented in the *Thesaurus*, while for Swift, the proper models were to be found in classical poets and classical poetics, and not the “barbaric” models of Northern poets. In the short term, Swift was the “winner”: after the death of Hickes in 1715 there was a sharp decline in antiquarian studies, and classical studies once again became the focus for scholars in Britain. Anglo-Saxon poetics would have to wait almost a hundred years for its star to ascend again with Rasmus Rask and Jacob Grimm. Hickes and the antiquarian movement would only be vindicated with developments that came later, which would put poetics and language in general back into their proper Germanic models, and finally reject the classical models of Swift and the classicists.
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